

1882.

THE CHRISTIAN
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

“Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.”

EDITED BY
E. W. HERNDON, A. M., M. D.

VOLUME I.

PRICE: TWO DOLLARS A YEAR.

COLUMBIA, BOONE COUNTY, MO.

NOTICE TO THE BINDER.

This form of four pages to be separated from this number and bound at the front of the volume.

ANNOUNCEMENT—1883.

This number closes the *first volume* of THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW. One year ago, realizing the necessity that existed for such a publication, after consultation and mature consideration, I determined to undertake the publication of a Quarterly Review devoted to *Primitive Christianity*. After one year's labor, I find that the brotherhood appreciate it and seem willing to sustain it by contributions to its pages and by their subscriptions. I desire to show my appreciation of this assistance by furnishing a better Magazine in 1883. I do not believe that the *contents* can be improved. I have read all the American Quarterlies carefully, with the idea of comparison always in my mind, and in my opinion the CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW has so far, as a whole volume, contained as timely and as able articles as have been furnished by any.

I propose to increase its size from 144 to 160 pages, and to print it on *fine book paper*. This will increase the cost to me, but the price to subscribers will remain the same. I feel encouraged to believe that it will grow in favor as it becomes better known to the public, and as a consequence its circulation will increase.

Those who are already subscribers are requested to renew their subscriptions as soon as possible and obtain as many new subscribers as they can, so that I may know how large an edition to print.

I desire to thank those who have contributed to its pages, to ask them to continue to do so, and to extend the request to others who have not yet contributed. It must not, however, be expected that every MS. that is submitted to me will be published. The decision must rest with me, and should I decline any contribution, it need not indicate to the writer that I do not appreciate or see merit in the article. It may be very valuable and at the same time untimely and unsuitable.

TERMS.

Price for one year,.....\$2.00
Single Number,..... .50

Money at my risk when sent by draft, P. O. order or registered letter. Address all communications to the Editor,

DR. E. W. HERNDON,
Columbia, Boone Co., Mo.

19961

PAPERS AND PERIODICALS.

NOTE.—The following is a list of the papers—weekly and monthly—published in the interest of the Christian Church. The list includes those published in the United States and elsewhere, so far as the names could be obtained:

WEEKLIES.

Christian Standard, Isaac Errett, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Christian Evangelist, J. H. Garrison, J. H. Smart and B. W. Johnson, St. Louis, Missouri.
Christian Preacher, C. M. Wilmeth, Dallas, Texas.
The Gospel Advocate, David Lipscomb, Nashville, Tennessee.
Christian Messenger, T. R. Burnett, Bonham, Texas.
Apostolic Times, J. W. Cox, Lexington, Kentucky.
Atlantic Missionary, P. S. Rhodes, Gordonsville, Virginia.
American Christian Review, J. F. Rowe, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Old Path Guide, F. G. Allen and G. W. Yancy, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Christian Commonwealth, W. T. Moore, London, England.
The Faithful Witness, J. M. Shepherd, Topeka, Kansas.

MONTHLIES.

Christian Monitor, Mrs. J. H. Smart, St. Louis, Mo.
The Watch Tower, J. L. Winfield, Washington, N. C.
Bible Index and Christian Sentinel, H. McDiarmid, Toronto, Canada.
The Apostolic Church, W. L. Butler, Mayfield, Ky.
The Christian Foundation, Aaron Walker, Kokomo, Indiana.
The Christian Missionary, R. Moffett, F. M. Green, Cleveland, Ohio.
The Christian Telescope, J. M. Ratcliffe, Watkinsville, Georgia.
The Pacific Church News, J. H. McCollough, San Francisco, Cal.
The Christian Advocate, G. Y. Tickle, Edinburg, Scotland.
Australian Christian Advocate, T. Smith, Melbourne, Australia.
The New Eng. Evangelist, F. N. Calvin and A. Martin, Worcester, Mass.
The Pastoral and Missionary Helper, Browning & Welch, Shelbyville, Mo.
The Christian Record, James M. Mathes, Bedford, Ind.

SEMI-MONTHLIES.

The Disciple, Thomas H. Blenus, River John, N. S.
Ecclesiastical Observer, David King, Birmingham, England.
Christian at Work, J. R. Farron, W. A. Cooke, Bell's Depot, Tenn.

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS—MONTHLY.

The Teacher's Mentor, Isaac Errett, F. M. Green, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Christian Sunday School Teacher, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.
The Word and the Work, C. C. Cline and P. H. Duncan, Louisville, Ky.
The Gospel Teacher, W. W. Dowling, St. Louis, Mo.

WEEKLY.

Sunday School Standard, ———, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Little Sower, W. W. Dowling, St. Louis, Mo.
Good Words, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Little Child, ———, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Little Pearls, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Sunny Side, W. W. Dowling, St. Louis, Missouri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY.

		PAGE.
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	I
2.	TRACES OF DEVELOPMENT IN NEW TESTAMENT THOUGHT. By G. W. LONGAN.....	4
3.	CREATION OR EVOLUTION. By GEO. C. SWALLOW, M. D., LL. D., Prof. of Natural History in the Missouri State University..	27
4.	THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By ROBERT T. MATHEWS, A. M.....	37
5.	THE EDUCATION OF PREACHERS. By JOHN W. MCGAR- VEY, A. M., Prof. in Bible College, Lexington, Ky.....	60
6.	INGERSOLL IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. By THE EDITOR.....	72
7.	THE EDUCATED MAN. By J. W. ELLIS, A. M., Pres. of Platts- burg College.....	85
8.	WERE THE BIBLE AND ITS RELIGION PLAGIARIZED FROM OTHER RELIGIONS AND THEIR SACRED BOOKS, LEGENDS AND MYTHS? PART I. By CLARK BRADEN, Author of "Problem of Problems".....	108
9.	THE FELLOWSHIP OF HIS SUFFERINGS. By J. W. MOUNT- JOY, A. M.....	127
10.	BOOK TABLE.....	137
11.	MISSIONS.....	143
12.	PERIODICALS.....	144

APRIL.

1.	THE ATONEMENT. By THOMAS MUNNELL, A. M.....	I
2.	THE PLANE OF SALVATION. By H. CHRISTOPHER, A. M., M. D.....	14
3.	WERE THE BIBLE AND ITS RELIGION PLAGIARIZED FROM OTHER RELIGIONS AND THEIR SACRED BOOKS, LEGENDS AND MYTHS? PART II. By CLARK BRADEN, Author of "Problem of Problems," etc.....	32
4.	OATHS, JUDICIAL AND PROFANE. By G. T. CARPENTER, A. M., Pres. of Drake University.....	46
5.	A DOUBT RAISED CONCERNING THE TYPICAL NA- TURE OF OLD TESTAMENT INSTITUTIONS. By A. B. JONES, A. M.....	57
6.	CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP WITH REFERENCE TO THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC. By HON. E. L. DONEY, LL. B.....	68
7.	THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL. PART I. By WM. J. BARBEE, A. M., M. D., Author of "Principles of Geology".....	79
8.	POPULAR LITERATURE AND PUBLIC MORALS. By F. D. SRYGLEY, A. M.....	103

APRIL CONTINUED.

	PAGE.
9. THE APOSTLESHIP vs. APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION. By JOHN T. WALSH, Author of "Looking Down the Ages".....	110
10. THE TRUE MISSION OF THE CHURCH. By F. D. POWER, A. M., Chaplain of the U. S. House of Representatives.....	119
11. AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.....	131

JULY.

1. OUR RELATIONS TO THE DENOMINATIONS. By A. J. THOMPSON, A. M.....	1
2. GOD'S TOUCH DIRECT TO-DAY. By W. B. GALLAHER, A. B.....	23
3. CERTAIN ALLEGED IMMORALITIES OF THE BIBLE. By G. W. LONGAN.....	35
4. OUR POWER AND OUR DANGER OF SUPPRESSING IT. By O. A. CARR, A. B.....	59
5. THE PERMANENT MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH. By A. E. MYERS, A. M.....	75
6. THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL. PART II. By WM. J. BARBEE, A. M., M. D.....	92
7. THE TENDENCY OF PROTESTANTISM. By J. S. LAMAR, A. M.....	107
8. AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.....	116

OCTOBER.

1. BACCALAUREATE SERMON. By M. RHODES, D. D., Pastor of St. Mark's English Evangelical Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo.	1
2. EXEGESES OF JOHN 16:8—MISSION OF THE SPIRIT. By ELDER G. R. HAND, Richmond, Mo.....	17
3. THE ALLEGED CRUELITIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By PROF. J. W. MCGARVEY, of Kentucky University, Lexington, Kentucky.....	24
4. INSPIRATION. By ELDER H. W. B. MYRICK, Geatryville, Mo.	40
5. THE NAME CHRISTIAN AND PRES. PENDLETON'S ESSAY. By ELDER B. U. WATKINS, Cameron, Mo.....	47
6. SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL. PART III. By W. J. BARBEE, A. M., M. D., President of Woodland College, Independence, Missouri.....	72
7. THE QUESTION SETTLED. By H. CHRISTOPHER, A. M., M. D., Independence, Mo.....	77
8. OUR ALTAR OF INCENSE. By N. S. HAYNES, Illinois State Evangelist, Decatur, Ill.....	90
9. REFLECTION ON A PAGAN PICTURE OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. By ROBERT T. MATHEWS, A. M., Minister of Richmond Street Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.....	96
10. AMONG OUR EXCHANGES—BOOK NOTICES.....	117

THE REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1882.

INTRODUCTION.

This is the first number of the first volume of "THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW." It speaks for itself. Some of the reasons that induced me to undertake its publication and editorial management, may with propriety be given.

Two previous attempts have been made in the same direction. They were edited by able men; they failed. Should the fact of their failure be a lesson to me and others, to prevent any one from attempting the same thing? I think not, and why?

In number of members, the Church of Christ has, since the time of the two former publications, twenty years ago, about doubled. We now number, as nearly as can be ascertained, *six hundred thousand* in the United States. Our educational facilities have increased, and also our individual wealth. Now there are more members to read; they are better qualified to read and appreciate such a publication; and are more able to meet the expense. All these changes have given us a standing in the religious world that we never had before. We are now "Evangelical" in the United States.

On account of the election to the Presidency of a brother, who was publicly identified with us, and whose sad death drew to him the eyes and hearts of the whole civilized world, we, as a religious people, have been brought very prominently to the notice of the general public and to the attention of prominent representative men. Although our weekly papers are ably conducted, and will compare most favorably with all other such publications, and have a special work to do, yet we need another kind of literature to meet

the wants indicated. Our own people are craving for more thoughtful and exhaustive articles than can be published by our Weeklies, and not having any of their own, are seeking them in other directions.

These, among others, are the reasons influencing me to this work. With two failures, as beacons to me, I venture, relying upon circumstances and the support of my brethren; who, if they desire such a publication, can have it, by giving it their support NOW.

You can judge, somewhat from this number, of my purpose and the style of the REVIEW; but I will state my intentions so that there may be no misunderstanding. It is my purpose, the Lord willing, to publish and to permanently establish a magazine that will be considered *the true exponent of the spiritual, literary and scientific culture of the Christian Church of the United States*, and thereby become the medium by which our best minds and hearts will communicate their best studied and most prayerful thoughts and investigations to the public. All such essays are earnestly requested for publication in this REVIEW. The Editor will demand a high standard of excellence in all articles published, and he being *sole* judge, according to his judgment no others will be admitted. He does not claim or demand that every idea advanced in articles offered for publication shall accord with his standard; but he must think that the essay is logical and not calculated to do harm.

There is no desire to confine our writers to any narrow groove, but a broad Christian catholicity, not broader however than the divine gauge, is permitted and desired. While this freedom is given, the Editor cannot be held responsible for the ideas advanced by his contributors. No discussions will be allowed except when requested by me.

We intend to make the reviewing of new books, that are of special interest, a prominent feature of this publication, so that we may assist its readers in selecting from the great mass of books now presented to the public.

I desire to keep a correct catalogue of our Schools, Periodicals and Missions, constantly in the REVIEW, and now ask those having charge of these several institutions to report at once.

It has been suggested that articles of the proper character could not be procured for the REVIEW without pecuniary compen-

sation, which being an impossible condition, the effort must fail. I have a different opinion. I do not believe our best writers wish to be paid for contributing to the pages of such a publication. I believe that they see that the necessity for it is so great, and the field of usefulness opened up to them is so vast, that they will cheerfully submit to the additional tax upon their time for the preparation of suitable essays, in order that the Church of Christ may be more honored and that they may do more good in the Master's vineyard. Brethren who can think and write well, who have studied in special directions; who have gone deeper than their brethren, are not only asked to write as much as possible, but are urged to do it as their Christian duty, for on this, more than any other thing, depends the success of this undertaking. Thinkers and writers outside of our fellowship, who have prepared essays on subjects of special interest and are seeking a medium through which to give them to the public, are invited to submit them to the Editor of this magazine, as he can assure them of appreciative readers.

The fundamental object of the publication is the upbuilding of the Church of Christ, and all of our efforts will centre around this one idea and purpose. We wish at all times to keep before its readers Christ the Man; Christ the Priest; Christ the Lawgiver; and Christ the Son of God. In doing this we can take only the Bible for our text-book, and doing that we will plead for a union of all who love the Christ. We are pupils to learn His will concerning us. As the ages have come and gone, human speculations have gathered around the divine teachings, to darken them, the same after Christ as before, and as Paul said, so say we in our chosen motto, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Praying that God will approve our work, and that we may be ever guided by His spirit, we commit THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW to Him through you.

THE EDITOR.

TRACES OF DEVELOPMENT IN NEW TESTAMENT THOUGHT.

The Bible is not a mechanical structure, but a growth from the religious life of many centuries. It is not a rule arbitrarily imposed from without, but a genuine, normal development from within. It marks the progress of spiritual ideas and institutions, as they were slowly unfolded under the guiding Providence of Almighty God. In the far-away ages of the primeval world, the Infinite Father undertook the task of guiding, uplifting and glorifying our race, and the Bible is both the record and product of His most gracious and wonderful work.

There are few distinctions more important than the one above indicated between mechanism and life. It lies at the basis of true, and false views of inspiration, and of the Bible, as a revelation from God. That the divine volume represents a spiritual progress, advancing, for the most part, *pari passu*, with the general growth of human thought, is, I think, now widely understood. But that there was any reason for this parallelism of growth apart from the simple will of the Almighty Father, is, to many minds, a doctrine by no means clear. The fact that God chose to reveal the truths of religion slowly, progressively, is duly conceded, but that he might not have chosen otherwise is tacitly held to be an improper limitation of the divine power. This, of course, means that the revelation might have been made at once, if only God had so willed. Such a position implies either a want of thought, or great mental confusion in regard to the whole question.

That the patriarchal and Jewish ages were preparatory, incomplete, and, in a sense, tentative, and that the Divine Will and Character only attain an adequate expression in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, will not be denied by any critical student of the Holy Book, who brings to his work sufficient intelligence and mental freedom to deal profitably with such questions. But, on the hypothesis that the revelation contained in the Scriptures might have been given complete at once, if such had been the will of God, the inquiry instantly arises, Why then all this waste of precious time? Why this long agonizing delay, while human souls were groping in

darkness, blindly feeling after God, and anxiously longing for the light? On the hypothesis before us, an answer to this question which shall satisfy the demands of the understanding is utterly impossible. This needs no further urging. The fact is, that God's ability to reveal spiritual truth is not absolute, but relative; that is, conditioned by the spiritual receptivity of the race, or individuals, for whom the revelation is intended. A mere formula of words that conveys no meaning is not in any true sense a revelation. Inspiration is indeed a supernatural illumination, but it attains its results through the normal functions and activities of the soul. It is a divine exaltation of the soul's powers, which enables it to see clearly, or catch glimpses of the truth, according to its own possibilities, or limitations. I think it was Dr. Mozley who said, that all God's revelations are rooted back in knowledge previously possessed. This goes to the heart of the matter. All higher revelations presuppose the lower as indispensable conditions. To reach the higher spiritual conceptions of the New Testament was as impossible, without the special training and preparation of the Old Testament, as is the comprehension of the higher problems of Geometry without a previous knowledge of the properties of lines and angles. In every case the foundation must be laid before the superstructure can be reared.

In a revelation made through the words of human speech, much more is presupposed than the superficial man imagines. Before words can be used as a vehicle of revelation, they must have acquired fixed meanings in the usage of the people for whom the revelation is intended. The relation between a word and the idea it represents is one of the closest that the human mind knows. The idea, of course, is first, and afterward, the word. But words and ideas must become permanently associated in thought and usage before language is a trustworthy medium of communication. A moment's thought will make this clear to the dullest understanding. Let us suppose, now, that God desires to reveal to men, in words, his own nature and attributes. It is plain that he must take the words of human speech just as he finds them in human usage, for, otherwise, they will not serve his purpose in the slightest degree. If, then, he would reveal himself as infinitely wise, it is presupposed that men already have some human conception of wisdom and of the distinction of finite and infinite, and that they have learned to express these conceptions in words to one another.

It will be no revelation for God to tell us that he is wise, unless, in our human ways of thinking and communicating, we already have both the idea and the word. This is plain. And so of God's power, and justice, and goodness, and love. The use of these words as a means of revelation is impossible, except to those who have the ideas which they represent, and have learned to associate the ideas with these particular words. But, if we have our human ideas of wisdom and justice and goodness and power, and have learned to distinguish our attainments in these things as relative, or limited, the revelation to us of God's character, as possessing all these attributes without limit, will be easy enough. Without this previous knowledge to serve as a foundation, it is clear, however, that such a word revelation is an impossibility. There must be knowledge previously possessed, into which the divine communications can be made to root back, and to which they may be attached as additional links to an existing chain. In the same way, if God would reveal to us His nature as spirit, contradistinguished from material substance and form, it is clear that we must previously have learned to differentiate spirit from substantive matter, both in thought and expression, or the revelation cannot be made by words. In this way it becomes plain that inspiration has to do first with progress in ideas, and with words only as their proper clothing. The sublime formula of Jesus, "God is Spirit," could mean nothing to one destitute of the conception of spirit. Prior knowledge, both as regards the idea and the word, is absolutely necessary in order that an expression which predicates spirit of God may become a fruitful proposition.

Whoever looks into these things so as to get even a little way below the surface, will begin to see why the All-wise Jehovah consumed so much time in giving the Bible to the world. The difficulty, it may be well to say, was not with God, but with man. With God, all truth, absolute and relative, was present from the beginning. How to get spiritual truth into the souls of men was God's problem. The Infinite Father must take the infant race, as a man takes his little boy, and train it, enlighten it, develop it, till the higher spiritual truths are made possible of attainment by the previous mastery of those which lie nearer the domain of sense-perception, and which connect most easily with the ordinary experiences of human life. The transition from the things of sense to the things of faith, from ordinary moral ideas to the higher spir-

itual truths, must be effected gradually and according to the laws which ordinarily guide the evolutions of human thought.

I suppose that the application of what I have now said to the Old Testament period will be readily made, and that the general principle laid down will, to that extent, be universally accepted. But this principle applies in full force to New Testament teaching as well. And it is the object of this paper to bring out the proofs of this position, and array them in intelligible order before the understanding. The gain will be, if I mistake not, a much clearer and better view of inspiration, and of the Bible as an inspired book. In the light of this better view, some infidel objections will disappear, and even the believer will be able to understand better the sacred oracles.

I wish now to call attention to certain facts which thoughtful students of the New Testament will, with a little effort of memory, be able at once to accept as facts, if indeed they have not already noticed and reflected upon them.

1. The central idea of the New Testament is, doubtless, the sacrificial death of the Lord Jesus for the sins of the world. But this key-note of the Gospel was not sounded, so far as the first three narratives inform us, until our Lord, in instituting the Supper, said, "This is my body broken for you; this is my blood in the New Covenant, shed for the remission of the sins of many." Standing alone, as it does in the first three Gospels, this utterance seems dark and enigmatical; but, in the light of apostolic teaching under the commission, it becomes a luminous point of great effulgence and power. In the fourth Gospel there are indeed allusions in the recorded teaching of the Master to this great truth, but it is either veiled in imagery or otherwise obscurely expressed. The fact insisted on is, that in the personal teaching of Jesus, as reported to us in the Gospels, this capital feature in the plan of redemption was only hinted at, rather than clearly and definitely announced. Why this was so, I do not stop to inquire. It is sufficient, at present, to note carefully the simple fact.

2. The baptism administered by Jesus, through his disciples, I suppose, will be frankly recognized as a continuation of the baptism and epoch of John the Baptist. This being understood, the teaching of our Lord, in person, (and this is certainly noteworthy) contains nothing in relation to the ordinance of baptism, save a few figurative allusions, until the giving of the Great Commission. I

simply call attention to this fact without offering a word of speculation as to its significance.

3. The fundamental New Testament idea of justification by faith, as opposed to justification by works of law, or other meritorious human works, had no clear formulation in the epoch of Christ's personal ministry. The first three Gospels contain no deliverance that is clearly to the point, if we except Mark's record of the Commission, the genuineness of which is reasonably questioned, and which therefore cannot certainly be relied upon in critical discussions. The fourth Gospel contains expressions more to the point, but it gives nothing that even approaches in clearness, or fullness, the discussions in the Pauline epistles. Let it be understood, however, that I, by no means, lose sight of the fact that the value and power of faith is a constant element in the teaching of Jesus, as reported by all the Evangelists. The point I urge is this: that the precise office of faith, in the justification of the sinner before God, is nowhere distinctly brought out in our Lord's personal teaching. Expressions in the fourth Gospel, which will readily occur to the mind in this connection, are, perhaps, seeming, but not real exceptions to this statement. It is one thing to announce, in a general way, the existence of a connection, but quite another to expound the nature of that connection. There is, at least, this difference between the fourth Gospel and the Pauline epistles. Besides, it will appear, a little further along, that there is a theory of this Gospel, which not only explains satisfactorily the present question, but clears up other difficulties of even greater magnitude.

4. In the whole personal ministry of our Lord, he only twice makes mention of the church. True, it may be said that the same general idea is found in the expression, "Kingdom of Heaven," so frequently recurring in the discourses and parables reported to us by the synoptists. No doubt, in a very general sense, the ideas are the same, but by no means definitely the same. In the expression, "Kingdom of Heaven," the conception is that of a kingdom or reign of righteousness, without special reference to institutional form, while in the word "church," the latter is the paramount idea. It will be remembered that Dr. George Campbell, in his translation of the Gospels, renders the Greek, "reign of Heaven," instead of "Kingdom of Heaven." A very little thought will suggest the bearing of this change upon the position above taken.

In his *Life of Christ*, Mr. H. W. Beecher says, that "Jesus did not come into the world to establish a church." If, by the word church, we mean a "Hierarchy," or a "Denomination," Mr. Beecher is, without doubt, correct. But that the "Building of a Church," in his own meaning of the word, was a part of our Lord's mission into the world, he expressly testifies, on one of the most memorable occasions of his life. But the church was to spring out of his life and death in the world, and not to assume historic form during his short stay in it. It is sufficient, now, to note the fact just stated, that in all his personal teaching, so far as it has been reported to us, our Lord refers to the church on but two occasions, and on these, only in briefest terms.

5. I note here also the fact that the sublime ideas of pre-existence, and Incarnation of the Word, are not found in the earlier, or synoptic Gospels, but only in the fourth Gospel, which the general voice of Christian antiquity has ascribed to the Apostle John. I speak of the synoptics as the earlier Gospels—not as the liberal critics (so called) designate them, the earlier forms of the Gospel tradition—because there can be no doubt, I suppose, that they were in general circulation for some considerable time before the fourth Gospel saw the light of day. The evidence is conclusive, that the fourth Gospel cannot be assigned an earlier origin than about the last decade of the first century. Those who deny the Johannean authorship, as is well known, put it much later. But the orthodox position is best defended, as the orthodox critics have generally now found, by dating it as late as possible in the career of the Beloved Disciple. It is difficult—I think impossible—to avoid believing that between the publication of the earlier narratives, and this later one, the law of development had been, in some shape, performing its work. That this may be held in harmony with the soundest orthodoxy, I hope to show before I conclude. For the present, the simple fact in the case, that the Pre-existence and Incarnation are peculiar to the fourth Gospel, is all that I insist upon.

What I have here presented, that I desire especially to emphasize, may be stated briefly as follows: that the teaching of Jesus in his personal ministry, and the teaching of the Apostles under the commission, and in the incipient stages of church organization and history, mark two distinctly defined epochs in the development of New Testament truth. And this is so, apart from the fact that, in the later period, the Apostles preached the death and resurrection of

Jesus as accomplished events, which, of course, could not have been done at an earlier date. This difference goes without saying. What I distinctly insist upon is, that in the teaching of Jesus and that of the Apostles, we have manifestly two distinct stages in the development—not to say evolution—of Christian ideas.

The great topic of Jesus in the recorded discourses and sayings found in the synoptics, is that of the true conception of a righteous human life. The Jews of his time were hopelessly befogged on this question. Conscious of their manifold failures on the moral side, feeling keenly their guilt before God, whenever they brought their lives into comparison with the ideal righteousness of the law and the prophets, they set about creating—perhaps, quite unconsciously—an ideal of righteousness, to which they might honestly attain, and on the ground of which they might expect the approbation and favor of God. This led them to magnify mere ritualism at the sacrifice of the higher moral truth, and to lay special stress on the traditions and legal glosses, which had come down to them as a heritage from the distinguished Scribes and Rabbis of former times. It is far easier to render punctilious observance to a ritual observance, than it is to crucify unholy passions and lusts. This fact accounts for the tendency to ritualism, which has manifested itself so frequently in all ages. Ungodly men, who desire to be on good terms with themselves and with God, are ever prone to fall into this mistake. And this special form of Judaism is, perhaps, almost as prevalent in the nineteenth century, and in our own land, as it was among the Jews in the time of Christ. When Jesus entered upon his work, the first thing necessary to be done that, indeed, without which nothing else could be done, was to expose this fatal delusion, and to destroy it root and branch. He denounced, in unsparing terms, the traditions and glosses with which the Jewish teachers had piously sought, as they were foolish enough to imagine, to “hedge in” the law, and define its observance. He gave them to understand clearly that their traditions were not only no part of the law, but that, in many instances they made it of no effect. He taught them that the great moral principles of justice, mercy and truth are the very essence of righteousness in the sight of God, and that ritualistic and traditionary forms, at the very best, are matters of minor consideration. He insisted that, in true righteousness of life before God, the state of the heart, or in other words, that which leads men to act, is even more important than the action itself. In

this way he brought out in bold relief the conception of a righteous life, as God looks at human life, and sought to make them feel that their own notion of such a life was only a hideous caricature, or, at most, a worthless counterfeit of the divine reality.

This vein of teaching runs through the whole personal ministry of our Lord, from its beginning in the Sermon on the Mount to his caustic and withering invective against the Scribes and Pharisees near its close. With the exception of the parables, which relate largely to the divine kingdom, or reign of Heaven, illustrating it from many points of view, by apt and beautiful analogies from the natural world, almost every saying of our Lord reported by the synoptists, tends unmistakably in the general direction which I have here sought to indicate. His teaching in regard to his own person, his pre-existence and ante-incarnation connection with the Father, reported in the conversations of the fourth Gospel, forms a separate feature and requires separate and special treatment. This interesting feature I shall touch a little further on, but cannot discuss at length in this short paper. Speaking broadly, then, the substance of our Lord's teaching relates either to the divine ideal of a true and righteous life, or to his personal dignity, as pre-existent Son of God, or Incarnate Word. He made no attempt to systematize or formulate his teaching according to scientific methods. His manner was to throw out great moral seed-truths, scattering them here and there, and, for the most part, on soil illy-prepared, trusting to the future for the discovery by his followers of the special position which they occupy as links in the divine chain.

The work of our Lord as teacher was, therefore, in the nature of further preparation. He began where the Baptist had left off. He discoursed concerning the things which were nearest to the people, and which they were best prepared to understand. And even then his utterances were often so revolutionary, from their point of view, that they were tempted to turn away in disgust. We can now see, I think, that an attempt at more rapid development would have been altogether premature. The doctrine of the Cross, so powerful a few years later, at this early stage, would have tended to repel rather than to attract. Even his most devoted and trustful disciples were not ready for it. The profound Pauline conception of "the righteousness of faith" would have proved a most fatal stumbling-block. The time for a speech on the forgiveness of sin, with the antecedents of faith repentance and baptism, had not

come. The great seed-truths contained in the discourses and conversations must have time to take root in the soil best prepared for them—the hearts of his constant followers—and the logic of events must play its part in helping forward the dull understandings of men. The Messiah must die and be buried and rise again. These events will throw floods of light on questions now wrapped in darkness. Many words of Jesus which before were insoluble enigmas, will then become plain. The facts and the teaching will mutually explain each other. In this way alone can the great revolution move forward.

In this paper I may take it for granted that the sacrificial death of Christ, the conception of the righteousness of faith, as contradistinguished from the righteousness of law, the forgiveness of sins to baptized believers, the mediation of Christ and his intercession as our High Priest, the abrogation of the law, or old covenant, and the introduction of the new covenant sanctified by our Lord's blood, will be at once recognized as fundamental ideas in the preaching of the Apostles under the commission and in all their teaching among the saints and in the churches.

We have, therefore, as has been suggested, two great periods of Gospel development, namely:—that which precedes, and that which follows the giving of the great commission. In the first period, the absence of the facts of the death and resurrection of our Lord made it impossible to unfold clearly the doctrinal truths which centre in them. Any attempt to do this must have measurably failed. We see, therefore, the wisdom of leaving these questions untouched till a later time. When the facts had transpired, the question of their significance would naturally arise, and the relation would be far more easily interpreted to the understanding.

Robert G. Ingersoll, in his lecture upon the question, "What Shall I do to be Saved?" tells us that the first three Gospels know nothing of the doctrine of salvation by faith—excepting, of course, the closing verses of Mark's Gospel, which he unhesitatingly pronounces a forgery—and that the fourth Gospel alone is orthodox, according to the modern standard on this question. Mr. I. caught a glimpse of the fact, but failed, as he too frequently does, to understand its true bearing and significance. The learned theologians, who replied to him, failed, so far as I noticed, to take even the least cognizance of the fact. When Mr. Ingersoll, in conversation with a reporter, charged them with dodging the issue, there was far too

much truth in the allegation. To thoughtful people, I need hardly say that the view of development, which I am here presenting, not only recognizes the fact, but satisfactorily explains it. In this case, however, as in others heretofore mentioned, the fourth Gospel must be separately considered.

In the distinction here made between the two great periods of New Testament growth, there is not only nothing to give comfort to the infidel, but, on the contrary, most valuable proof of the historical faithfulness of, at least, the first three Gospels. If these Gospels were books of dogma, rather than trustworthy narratives, we should, without doubt, find in them all the characteristic teaching of the later period, in which we know that they were written. The oral Gospel had been widely preached, and very many churches had been planted, before even the earliest of the written narratives appeared. If the synoptists are not faithful historians, how can we account for the absence of anachronisms? Is it not clear, in such a case, confusion as to the stages of progress would have been almost, if not absolutely, certain, and that the line of demarcation between ante-commission and post-commission teaching would have been wholly obliterated? Nothing can be more sure. And yet there is no confusion, no transfer of the questions of a later period to the earlier, not a word to indicate that the writers even knew anything of these later questions. The contents of the first three Gospels show clearly that the writers are dealing with the first period of mental and historical development, and are, therefore, *prima facie*, trustworthy narrators. There is no introduction, anywhere, of things which belong to a later date. The writers transfer themselves at once to the historic time and environment of Christ's life and remain there to the end. As genuine histories, this is what we should expect, but as forgeries or untrustworthy records of mingled fact and fable, it would be altogether unaccountable. The manifest fitting together of the two stages of development, according to the logical order of a great movement, attests the essential verity of the entire account.

But the gradual unfolding of Christian ideas did not stop with the entrance of the apostles on their ministry under the commission. On the contrary, the whole apostolic age was one of continuous advancement in supernatural truth. This, as has been stated, is now quite generally allowed, however imperfectly its meaning may be comprehended. If this paper serves, in any measure, to bring out

this meaning, its end will be, so far, accomplished. This is the writer's highest ambition in preparing it.

But before entering the Acts and Epistles, which I shall soon do, it is necessary to redeem my promise to consider briefly some peculiarities of the fourth Gospel and its relations to the other three. This Gospel was undoubtedly written very late in the first century (the liberal critics say later still) and therefore near the close of the apostolic age. The destruction of the holy city by Titus had been long an accomplished fact, and the other apostles—assuming this Gospel to have been written by the apostle John—were quietly sleeping in their graves. In this Gospel, therefore, it is natural to believe that the New Testament conception of our blessed Lord reaches its final form. The development of Christian ideas having kept pace with the outward development of the church, many things had now become very plain which, in the beginning, had been shrouded in thick darkness. The logic of outward events had aided the inward illumination of the Spirit, and questions were now regarded as settled which had formerly been the occasion of bitter strife. Granting, as I do, that the main purpose of this Gospel was not to supplement the other three, still, it must have been written with a full knowledge of their contents, and that it is, incidentally, supplementary to them, cannot, I think, be called in question. On this point the internal evidence is of itself sufficiently conclusive.

It was said, a few moments since, that the idea of the Pre-existence and Incarnation of the Logos in the man Jesus is peculiar to this Gospel. On this point I desire now to fix attention. It is clear that this idea cannot be gathered from the other three. If we had only them, the doctrine of Christ's essential Deity could never have been an article of faith, or question of controversy, unless it had been deduced from expressions found in the Pauline epistles. It is certain that the synoptics would never have suggested it to any mind. And yet, with the light which the fourth Gospel gives us, we see clearly that in one passage, at least, of the earlier narratives, the same sublime idea is certainly implied.

"In that hour, Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes; even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth

who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him."—Matthew, 11:25-27, Luke, 10:21, 22.

This is marvelously like the fourth Gospel. Its ring is indeed so similar as almost to suggest the possibility of a transfer from that Gospel to its present position. But there is nothing, I believe, to warrant such a supposition. Standing alone, we should make little out of it, but read in the light of the later Gospel, we cannot fail to hear in it the echoes of those wonderful utterances which sank so deep into the heart of the loving John. To his love-attuned soul, words like these were a far deeper and holier melody than even the rhythmic roar of the waves of his own Galilean Sea. The idea of John is here, in the older narratives—not fully brought out indeed, but certainly and unmistakably here.

One other peculiarity of this Gospel I have mentioned, and upon it I wish to fix a moment's attention. The general conception of salvation by faith, though less systematically shaped than in the longer Pauline epistles, is yet quite distinctly promulgated. Expressions in point will at once occur to the mind of the thoughtful student of this Gospel, and I need not pause to make quotations. But we have seen that this idea is not distinctly formulated in the synoptics, if we except the doubtful passages at the close of Mark's narrative. I do not here introduce other peculiarities, because these are sufficient to illustrate the principle I am contending for in this paper, and I do not wish to encumber the discussion with needless details.

In accounting for the facts now before us, it is safe, in beginning, to assume for John a higher spiritual receptivity than can be credited to any other member of the original College of Apostles. Perhaps, in this respect, even the Apostle to the Gentiles might hardly compete for the palm against him. There was a reason why Jesus loved John so pre-eminently, and there is little risk in believing that this reason is found in the peculiarity here assumed. If we may take it for granted, for the time being, that he wrote the fourth Gospel, and the first epistle which bears his name in our canon, the assumption will become an open fact. For this writer, whoever he may have been, was a man of profound spiritual intuitions and deep spiritual culture. If John was the writer, it is clear that his powers of spiritual perception must have far surpassed those of his apostolic colleagues in the mother church. He entered

more profoundly into the spirit of the Gospel discourses and conversations, and attained to a deeper and richer communion with the inner life of the Divine Teacher. In such a soul great seed-truths at first apprehended imperfectly, or not at all, would linger quietly for a while, then slowly germinate, and finally unfold into beautiful life. Mystic utterances, starting worlds of marvelous suggestions, would play through his heart, striking each moment responsive chords, to breathe forth heavenly melody.

It is easy to see that one so richly endowed must linger long over the Master's profounder disclosures, while less receptive natures, perceiving little meaning in the words, would soon cease to hold them in remembrance. He who cannot realize all this in thought has little apprehension of the more occult facts of human psychology.

Let it be supposed, then, that these peculiarities of the fourth Gospel are simply the fuller development of, it may be, certain fragmentary utterances of the Master, wrought out under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit through the normal functions and activities of the writer's own soul, and we shall have a solution of the problem entirely consistent with the tradition of the church that it was written by the Apostle John. Is not this explanation satisfactory? Does it not meet the demands of the understanding? I confess that it seems so to me. This solution being accepted as at least reasonable, it remains to say that the writer of this Gospel makes no pretense (nor, for that matter, do the others) of giving the exact words of the Great Teacher, but is content, if he seizes, and conveys clearly, the divine thought. That he often clothes our Lord's thoughts in his own peculiar way, and in the verbal forms of a later period than that represented by the synoptists, may be admitted without the least damage either to the authority or spiritual value of his work. Of the fact that he has done this, I do not, myself, entertain a doubt. Why should this be thought a strange thing? Or why should one hesitate to make an admission, which candid criticism imperatively requires? The thoughts of Jesus in the peculiar clothing of the Beloved Disciple's mental and moral idiosyncrasies, and verbal forms, are none the less, on that account, the thoughts of God. Not, given linguistic combinations, but the faithful expression of divine truth, is the proper test of a message from the upper sphere. Making due allowance for such difference in the mere mode of conception as must always exist in

great original minds, everything which the writer of the fourth Gospel has said, in regard to our Lord's divinity, may be duplicated from the unquestionably genuine epistles of the Apostle Paul. Murphy, in his work, entitled "*Scientific Bases of Faith*," has shown this clearly by placing in juxtaposition the chief deliverances, on this question, of these grand apostolic men.

If it be said, then, that the fourth Gospel puts into the lips of Jesus certain sayings in regard to his own person, which are not found in the other Gospels, it, by no means, follows that these sayings are not essentially historical. He may indeed give them to us in the more fully developed form of a later period, but the germs, let us not doubt, were in the very words spoken by the Lord's own lips. If he brings out more clearly than his co-evangelists, the idea of salvation by faith, or more strictly, of faith as the germ of "eternal life" in the soul, (for this is the writer's way of conceiving the matter) the same position holds good even here. Minds constituted as were those of Paul and the writer of this Gospel must, evermore, be struggling after a satisfactory explanation of our Lord's authority and power, and the inward illumination of the Spirit would lead them forward from the simple germs of Christ's personal teaching to the full-orbed truth which they have given us. And so of the question of salvation by faith. A conception more or less scientific in form is absolutely necessary to the satisfaction of minds of this class. And it is noteworthy that, in regard to the office of faith in salvation, these writers reach a final conception, which, while it is essentially the same, is at the same time diversely represented, according to the mental idiosyncracies of the individual. Paul says, "Faith is imputed for righteousness;" "We are justified by faith." The writer of the fourth Gospel says, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that every one who believes on him may have everlasting life." "He that believes on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believes not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." Paul habitually conceives of faith as the ground of righteousness with God, while the writer of the fourth Gospel conceives of it as the first impulse of eternal life in the soul. It is not difficult to see that in each case the conception is shaped by the dominant tone of the individual mind.

If then it appears to be true, that we find the two great periods of development somewhat blended in the fourth Gospel, as they

are not in the synoptics, and if we find that the writer of this Gospel seems to put his own words and mannerisms into the lips of the great Teacher, his testimony is not therefore damaged, nor is his historical accuracy to be, for a moment, called into question. The divine thought, not the human vocable, whether Hebrew, Greek, or Sanscrit, is the real word of God. The things of revelation, not the mannerisms of this or that inspired man, are the things which we are concerned to know. The thoughts of the Spirit, transferred to our vernacular by an uninspired translator, put us on an equality with those who read the original tongues. If our version gives faithfully the divine thoughts, in our English speech, then it is as much the word of God as the very sentences penned by inspired Apostles or Evangelists.

Passing into the Acts of the Apostles, we find at first little advance from the synoptists, except that which must necessarily spring from the transpired facts of the death and resurrection of Jesus, and a clearer perception of the way of pardon and life through him. Repentance and forgiveness of sins, through his name, are at once clearly proclaimed to anxious souls. Slowly, however, new questions arise. And, as the minds of the Apostles grapple with these questions, the Spirit leads them along their way. First, comes the choice of "the seven" to take care of the tables, then the appointment of Overseers, Evangelists, Deacons, everything in the order of its necessity, in a normal course of development. The necessities of historical progress contain the suggestion of every forward movement. To this I believe there is no exception. The Spirit of God leads them, let us devoutly confess, but the spontaneous activities of their own spirits are called into play at every step. The real advance is from within rather than by mechanical action from without. The problem comes first, the solution is attained afterward. Orderly development is the unmistakable law of this new and marvelous life.

But the question of questions, for that age, came with the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. This, like all other questions, as said above, came in the order of necessary historical sequence. It was not so difficult, under the extraordinary circumstances which guided him, for Peter to satisfy the Jewish-Christian church that he did right, in an exceptional case, to go in among uncircumcised men, and to eat with them. That this exception should become the rule, was quite another thing. For this, none,

apparently, were, at first, fully prepared. But what else could the conversion of the Gentiles mean? Must every Gentile Christian accept circumcision, and become a Jew? Is this to be the test of fellowship with the mother church? And are all recalcitrants to suffer excommunication, or social and ecclesiastical ostracism? What can be done? How is this most threatening imbroglio to be cleared up to the satisfaction of Jewish and Gentile believers alike? It is undeniable that there was sharp contention. It is certain that on the part of a portion of the mother church there was manifested much miserable narrowness, and that the controversy which ensued gave rise to great bitterness. Alas! human nature is so weak! And, sad to say, it is much the same to-day that it was two thousand years ago. Doubtless there are men living now who, if they had been members of the first Christian church, would have Judaized to the disgust of the better disposed even of their own class. And if there be some such who honestly suppose that the maintenance of the greatest movement of modern times rests with them, let us not think that it is a strange thing. "If we had lived in the days of our fathers, we would not have done as our fathers did"! Will men never understand themselves? But the world moves, nevertheless. May God accelerate its speed along all right lines!

But why was not this question settled on its first asking? Why was it that so many were found in the mother church who were ready to become zealous propagandists of the narrow, unevangelical view? Why were they suffered so long? Was not the authority of the Apostles at Jerusalem reverently acknowledged by the whole church? Would not three lines from Peter, James and John, have put to shame the whole body of Judaizers? Why did they not speak and put an end to strife? These questions carry us into the very heart of things. Let us go where truth leads without a single tremor of fear. True faith is always brave; it is only superstition that covers and grows pale!

The battle opened at Antioch where the Disciples were first called Christians, and where the church first stood forth before the world as something more than a mere Jewish sect. When Paul returned to Antioch after his great evangelical journey through the island of Cyprus and into the interior of Asia Minor, he seems to have found the Judaizers fairly installed and vigorously pressing upon the Antiochan Disciples their narrow creed.

"And certain men who came down from Judea taught the

brethren, and said, Except you be circumcised after the manner of Moses you cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they—*i. e.*, the church at Antioch—determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain other with them, should go up to Jerusalem, to the Apostles and Elders about this question."

This was the beginning, but the end was yet a great way off. Paul says in the Galatian letter that he went up by revelation, while Luke says he was sent up by the church at Antioch. There is no contradiction between them, as may be seen at a glance. The time had come for effective action. An authoritative decision must be reached, or the most disastrous results will speedily ensue. Paul saw clearly that a great crisis was impending. He had come to realize, in a measure, the grandeur of the work which he had begun among the Gentiles, and was able to grasp somewhat distinctly the essential conditions of future success. Would the Gentiles listen to his plea for Christ if it came to them associated with circumcision and a burdensome ritual? He saw clearly that they would not. The Gospel must be disengaged from mere Judaic forms, or his work must suddenly come to an end. The question whether he had been running in vain came to his heart as a bitter agony. It was not, I venture to suggest, as Doctor Farrar seems to think, that Paul was somewhat undecided at this time, in his own mind, as to the question presented by the Judaizers, but whether he could count on the sympathy and co-operation of the older Apostles and the church at Jerusalem, in his great work.

With him this latter was the real question of anxiety. He had preached a catholic Christianity in Cyprus and Asia Minor "by revelation of the Lord Jesus." On this point, therefore, he could not doubt. Had the guidings of the Holy Spirit led the older Apostles to the same point? This was the one question which took possession of his soul. With the original Apostles and the church at Jerusalem against him, he could not hope to achieve the grand triumphs which seemed otherwise to be fairly within his reach. And these Judaizers had come from Judea, doubtless from Jerusalem. How far did they represent the settled convictions of the leaders in the mother church? He saw distinctly the peril, and, though filled with grave anxiety, resolved to meet it courageously. It is impossible that a thoughtful man should fail to see in this whole transaction the natural processes which mark the stages of a

great movement. The operation of the same intellectual and sociological laws, which give shape to all such movements, is as clearly traceable here as in the modern movements of Luther, Wesley and Campbell. While there was divine guidance from above, let us not doubt, there was, at the time, on the human side, as distinct a grapple of the understanding with the several points involved, as though the actors had been left entirely to their own wisdom. The solution of one of the greatest of our modern questions is wrapped up, if I mistake not, in this short statement. Those who have eyes to see will know what I mean. And as for those who have not eyes, or having eyes will not look, it would be useless to trouble with them.

Among the "certain other" who went up with Paul and Barnabas from Antioch, was a young Greek whose name was Titus. He was destined to do a great work in the world, and to be honorably known through all the ages. At this time, however, he was a mere novice in the church of God. This Titus had never been circumcised, and in him the whole controversy assumed a concrete form. If circumcision is to be the rule, then Titus must submit to be circumcised. If a Christian Jew may not associate with an uncircumcised Greek, even though he be a Christian, then the Christians in Jerusalem cannot receive Titus as a brother in the church of God, or admit him hospitably into their humble Jewish homes. Paul foresaw all this, and doubtless chose to put the issue in this practical form, when he determined that Titus should bear him company. Whether he finally consented to the circumcision of his Greek convert, we shall never certainly know, for he has not distinctly informed us, and the learned doctors differ in regard to it. Let us cherish the faith that he remained steadfast to the end, and that neither by "compulsion," nor in the way of compromise, did he yield to the clamor of "false brethren, privily introduced, to spy out his liberties in Christ." It will be pleasant to believe that he did not.

Paul was not only a brave Christian man, he was an accomplished diplomatist as well. He made it his first care, on his arrival in the Holy City, to seek out the leaders of the church, and to have an earnest conference with them. "I went up," he says, "by revelation, and communicated to them that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, *but privately to them which were of reputation*, lest by any means I had run, or should run in vain."

Peter, James, and John, the pillars in the church, must be won over, before the matter is submitted to the whole assembly. The event justified his wisdom. The "pillars" were satisfied—at least for the time—Peter and John, I believe, for all time. As to James the Lord's brother, the case is different. His speech before the assembly was a compromise speech, and that it was a compromise speech, in the light of subsequent events, attests its genuineness. The decision was a compromise decision, and contained a concession to the Judaic party. Paul understood this at the time, but was content to have achieved a practical victory. But neither he nor the Judaic party accepted it as final. The clause containing the concession he distinctly repudiates in his letters, and the Judaizers acted from the beginning just as though no understanding had been reached. How far James sympathized with the party of agitation, it is impossible to tell, unless some one can first say precisely how much is meant by Paul's reference (Gal. 2:12.) to "certain that came from James"—who stirred up strife at Antioch, and led Peter into an open "dissimulation," which sticks to him, as a blot upon his escutcheon, even to this day. Suffice it to say that the battle raged along the whole line, in Galatia, in Corinth, in Rome, to the end, perhaps, of Paul's most laborious, and self-sacrificing, life. That James, the Lord's brother, never rose to the higher, and more catholic conception, which Paul styles "my (his) gospel," is corroborated by the epistle which bears his name, the genuineness of which, in the light of our later critical discussions, is placed, I think, beyond reasonable doubt.

But the attitude of the church in Jerusalem, at a much later date, toward Paul and the Catholic gospel which he preached, may be gathered from what occurred on the occasion of his visit to that city, after his second great missionary journey in Asia Minor and Europe. He came, as the bearer of liberal contributions, from his converts abroad, to the suffering poor in the Jewish capital. It was more than a benevolent contribution that he brought. It was that, of course, but it was a peace-offering as well. He hoped, let us not doubt, to put an end forever to the opposition he had encountered from Judaic emissaries, in his great work in Gentile lands. When it was, at first, settled that he should go to the Gentiles, the leaders in Jerusalem insisted that he should remember the suffering poor of the mother church. Though Paul asserts that he did not need to have such an obligation laid upon him, we may

regard his present visit, in part, at least, as intended to attest his fidelity to the old understanding. Luke says, "he was gladly received by the brethren." Indeed, the bounty which it was known he had brought, was certain to receive a favorable reception. It would not look well to accept a gift, and, at the same time, coldly to spurn the giver. They listened to the report of Paul regarding the great work which had been accomplished among the Gentiles, by his ministry and "glorified God." Less than this, they could not well do. But they said:

"Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are who believe, and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews that are among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk according to the customs. What is it, therefore? They will surely hear that thou art come. Do, therefore, this that we say unto thee. We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads; and all may know that those things whereof they are informed concerning thee are nothing; but that thou thyself walkest orderly, and keepest the law."

On its face, Paul must have regarded this proposition as an open indignity, which he could not accept without personal humiliation. In the Roman letter, he had bravely held, that, between Jew and Gentile there is no difference with God. In the second letter to the Corinthians, he had argued the abrogation of Mosaism in the plainest possible terms. To the Galatians he had written: "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." "I would they were cut off that trouble you." "All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "If I yet preach circumcision, why am I yet persecuted? Then is the offense of the cross ceased." "Neither they themselves who are circumcised, keep the law; but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh." Doubtless he had been willing that Christian Jews should circumcise their children if they wished, but he had long since said there was nothing in it, even to a Jew. The law was dead. The customs had lost their value. To be in Christ was everything, to be a circumcised Jew was nothing. To follow a dead ritual was an unmeaning form, and he could not do it without personal inconsistency.

I do not stop to discuss the reason why Paul accepted the proposition of the leaders in Jerusalem, further than to say, that he could go through a dead form without violence to his conscience, and that it had been his unvarying rule in life to accept reproach, or shame, if thereby the cause of human salvation might be promoted. For my present purpose it is, however, incumbent to say that this whole transaction reveals but too clearly the status of the church in the Holy City. Up to this date, (58 A. D.) every man of the many myriads was zealous of the law and utterly unable to tolerate in a Jewish Christian any neglect of its most formal precepts. They could fraternize, at a distance, with converted Gentiles, but to receive the uncircumcised to an equal fellowship in the mother church, and in their homes, was evidently no part of the bond, as they understood it. Their boasted zeal of the law shuts out any other opinion. That any of the older Apostles were present in the city does not appear, and we may be glad to believe they were not. Paul's reception, mentioned by Luke, was a reception evidently by the chief brethren—perhaps, as Doctor Farrar supposes, the Elders of the church, under the presidency of James, the Lord's brother, who, he thinks, was not the son of Alpheus, one of the original twelve, but a son of Mary and Joseph, and brother of Jesus, according to the flesh.

The important point to be noted, however, is the unquestionable devotion of the whole church to the Judaic ritual. They were utterly unable to take in the full scope of the New Testament idea. And yet this church had enjoyed the ministry and teaching of the eye-witnesses of our Lord's life and death. The men who had seen him alive after his resurrection, had been their leaders and teachers.

How painfully slow is human progress under the most favorable circumstances! Had even the apostles of the circumcision, at this date, fully grasped the breadth of Paul's great conception? It is difficult to believe that they had. There is much indeed to suggest that they had not. Perhaps it was years after that they wholly escaped the fetters of Judaism. On this point I will not dogmatize this way or that. Let every man seek truth for himself in the record that God has given to us.

But this is apparent: The emancipation of the early church from Judaism was a slow and painful progress. There was supernatural illumination within, there was providential guidance with-

out, but the souls of inspired men were left in the free and full play of all their faculties, just as though nothing out of the common course of things had been going on. The members of the Apostolic College were, indeed, acknowledged leaders and guides, but they were not spiritual autocrats. Nothing was decided by their mere arbitrary dictum. In the council at Jerusalem, "The Apostles and Elders came together to consider the matter."

But that this "consideration" took place in the hearing of the church is evident from the fact that "all the multitude kept silence while Paul and Barnabas declared the wonders which God had wrought among the Gentiles by them," and from the further fact that "the whole church" joined in the decision finally promulgated. (Acts 15:12 and 15:22). It appears then that inspiration implies no departure from the fixed laws of human thought, and that the great questions which arose, from time to time, were real questions to each individual actor in the exciting and wonderful drama which was going on. It was through struggle and conflict that the primitive church slowly disengaged itself from narrow Judaic prejudices, and finally emerged into the fullness of catholic truth.

To this law, even the Apostles themselves, were no exception. The Gospel, as it finally came to be understood, was indeed a revelation from God, but, on the human side, it was a development, a growth, through many years of anxious, and often discouraging experience. And this progress, under immediate divine guidance, continued to the end of the Apostolic age. Not sooner was the inspired canon complete. When the venerable Disciple, who had leaned on Jesus' breast, was called to his reward, the work of revelation ended. God had said what he wished to say to mankind, and the record was closed.

But it was not possible that any one, in that age, could comprehend the vast scope and grandeur of this revelation. Not even the inspired Apostles did this. The limitations of the human mind compel us to this conclusion. But the rudimental ideas of the Christian Religion had taken on a permanent form. The lines of future progress had been definitely fixed, and henceforth, all normal development must proceed along these lines. So much had been accomplished, and the work had been done for all time.

For myself, I believe that the Christian Religion should be better understood to-day than it was possible for any one to understand it in the Apostolic age. I do not say it *is* better understood:

only that it should be. If we do not understand it better, it is because unhomogeneous elements have been incorporated into the body of Christian truth, whereby false lines of development have been established and mental confusion has ensued. There can be no other reason.

Can it be that the experience of two thousand years has yielded no fruit? Has the irrepressible intellect of the race succeeded in acquiring no form of knowledge which throws back its light on the pages that record the struggles and triumphs of ancient teachers and seers? Let him think it who can.

For myself, I will have none of it. The man of God, let us not hesitate to believe, who studies the Holy Word to-day with the same freedom from bias, that the man of science studies God's other book, ought to have, nay, will have, a larger and loftier knowledge of divine things than was possible to any soul in the far away ages that are gone. Why not? God is leading us still. His Spirit is with us and in our hearts, not indeed to inspire, as in the beginning—for that is no longer necessary—but to help us, evermore, in our ceaseless progress along the lines which he himself so long ago established.

Let us hold up our heads and be hopeful. Let us be brave and strong in the Lord's cause. Let us not despair of the world's future. There is, indeed, a better time coming. For this, God's wisdom stands pledged to the intelligent believer. There shall be, in the world's hereafter, a wiser and better generation than has hitherto been. The creation of man was not a hazardous experiment whose wisdom the final event may fail to justify. Let us trust God, that the end shall fitly crown the beginning. In this sublime faith, may the Lord help us both to live and die. And to His Great Name, be praise forever and ever.

G. W. LONGAN.

CREATION OR EVOLUTION?

Until these latter days, all Christians, and nearly all scientists believed that God created the heavens and the earth and every living thing. But now many believe the heavens and the earth and all living things were evolved out of a Star-Dust or Nebulous Matter that once filled all space.

We thus name two theories to account for the present condition of things in the universe: the one by Creation and the other by Evolution.

The theory of Creation declared that God created, or brought into existence, the matter of which the Physical Universe is composed, and that the earth and all the heavenly bodies were formed out of this original matter by the direct act of the Creator, and by his personal oversight and supervision; and that all species of plants and animals were formed by his creative fiat.

The theory of Evolution declares that the earth and the heavenly bodies were formed from a nebulous matter, that filled all space, by the action of natural laws and without any direct interposition of an external agency; that all the species of plants and animals were formed from the materials of the earth by natural laws alone, without any special interposition of external power, or creative act.

THE ISSUE MADE.

Did God create the Physical Universe, the animals and plants that live upon the earth, or were they evolved by natural laws from pre-existing matter? This is essentially the issue presented by Evolutionists. It is, however, but fair to say some Evolutionists like Darwin, admit the creation of the lower animals, but believe the higher orders were evolved from the lower by natural laws; but the theory of Evolution, as held by leading representatives of the theory, covers all worlds, and all animals and plants without a creator or a creation.

Is Creation or Evolution most in accord with the present state of scientific and religious knowledge, most in accord with all we know?

THE HYPOTHESIS OF EVOLUTION.

1. Evolution teaches that a primeval Star-Dust, a Nebulous Matter, filled all space; that this nebulous matter under the influence of Chemical and Physical laws began to unite, condense and revolve; and that masses were thrown off, like water from a revolving grindstone; that these masses continued to revolve and throw off other masses until all the worlds and systems of worlds, which constitute the Universe, were formed.

2. When by this process of formation our earth reached a condition suited to living beings, C., O., H. and N. united and formed protoplasm. This protoplasm possessed life as an inherent property, precisely the same as sulphate of copper possesses the blue color as an inherent property.

3. That specks of protoplasm, by a process of natural law, called, "*Survival of the Fittest*," or "*Natural Selection*," were evolved into the lowest animals or Protozoa, and Protozoa into Polyps, and Polyps into Molluscs, Molluscs into Worms, Worms into Fishes, Fishes into Amphibians, Amphibians into Reptilians, Reptilians into Birds, Birds into Mammals, and Mammals into Men; and thus, by the survival of the fittest, all the 500,000 species of animals were formed by the laws of nature, without any creative act. Such is Evolution!

CARDINAL POINTS OF THE HYPOTHESIS.

There are five cardinal points in this process of Evolution, around which the battle of the Scientists and Christian Philosophers has raged these hundred years; and as the system, with its various parts, rests upon these five points, or assumed facts, it must stand or fall, as these assumed facts are proved to be true or false. Let us see if they will stand the test of sound science and Christian Logic.

I. Whence came the Nebulous Matter from which the worlds were evolved?

Some say it was eternal, and thus relegate it, as they suppose, to realms beyond causation and the reach of logic; but if matter was eternal, then gravitation and chemical affinities, which are inherent properties of matter, must have been eternal also; and as a necessary consequence, the combinations, condensations and resolutions, by which the worlds were made, must have been eternal too, and hence there never was any nebulous matter; and the theory swallows its own head and commits logical suicide.

But Science has well-nigh demonstrated the fact that matter is made up of some sixty-four substances, each of which consists of atoms precisely alike in form, size, color and all other properties; and that these atoms unite and form crystals, each substance always assuming the same geometric form: some, like gold and galena, always forming monometric solids. These and similar facts show that atoms of matter are manufactured articles.

If we should visit one of the ruined Pueblos of Arizona and find a house made up of a series of rooms, all alike in size, form and structure; and all built out of limestone ashlers of precisely the same form and size, you would say those houses were built by intelligent beings, and that the limestone blocks of which they were built, are manufactured articles.

But the atoms of matter present arguments a thousand fold stronger to prove that they are manufactured articles than the ashlers of a Pueblo; and yet you would esteem me daft should I tell you those Pueblo ruins never were made, but have existed always—are eternal.

But if Science had left any doubt that matter was created, the testimony of the Bible is positive and often repeated in various forms. Creation permeates the whole Bible and is the potential element of Biblical teaching.

II. NEBULAR THEORY OF LA PLACE.

Were all the worlds evolved out of an original Nebulous Matter? If Matter is eternal, the answer must be in the negative, as I have shown; but if Matter was created in the nebulous form, the evolution into the worlds becomes by natural law more plausible.

The scientific evidence upon which this theory rests is astronomical, and outside of my special lines of investigation.

I may say that this Nebular Hypothesis of La Place is very generally accepted, with the protest that it does not account for all the facts.

The fact that some of the moons of the solar system revolve around their primaries in a direction contrary to that in which they would revolve had they been thrown off by revolving central masses, is deemed by some fatal to the theory.

The late Prof. Benj. Pierce, of Harvard, than whom none was better qualified to speak on this question, once said in the

American Association, "The Nebular Hypothesis of La Place is a mathematical impossibility."

But the Bible seems to be clear and positive that the Worlds, the Sun, the Moon and the Stars, were made by God "to rule the day" and "the night," for "seasons" and for "years," as stated in Genesis 1:14-18.

"The firmament showeth his handiwork." These, and a hundred similar passages, utterly fail to meet the object for which they were stated, unless the earth and the heavenly bodies are the immediate result of the special exercise of God's formative power.

III. SPONTANEOUS GENERATION OF EPICURUS.

Shall we accept the Epicurean Theory of the spontaneous generation of the first animals?

The arguments for it are:

1. Living protoplasm is dredged up from the depths of the ocean;

2. Life is an inherent property of Protoplasm;

3. The germs from which all living plants and animals come are protoplasm.

1. Mollusks and Radiates and other animals are dredged up from the depths of the sea without proving them spontaneous productions.

2. There is no proof that any protoplasm ever was formed by chemical affinity alone; and we have no testimony that any ever was formed without the aid of pre-existing living beings. In fact, there is no evidence of the spontaneous, or even artificial generation of protoplasm, whether it be living or dead.

3. And besides, life is not an inherent property of protoplasm, because we find protoplasm as dead as Julius Cæsar. True protoplasm is found without life, whereas sulphate of copper is always blue, and you cannot destroy the color without destroying the sulphate itself; since then we can destroy the life of protoplasm without destroying the protoplasm itself, life is not an inherent property of protoplasm. If, therefore, the spontaneous production of protoplasm were proved, it would be no proof of the spontaneous production of living beings.

A vast number of very ingenious and interesting experiments have been made to prove the spontaneous generation of organic beings, but all have proved failures.

Some thirty years ago, one Dr. Crosse announced his success;

that he had evolved new animals by passing a galvanic current through certain solutions. These minute beings were all alike and were named *Acarus Crossii*, in honor of their creator. But alas! for human hopes! Dr. Crosse exhibited his experiment; and the little mites came trooping up the wires from the productive solution. But an observer recognized them as old acquaintances. They were the well known little *spiders*, *Acarus horridus*! and Dr. Crosse was compelled to step down from the high throne of a creator to the very humble seat of a *hatcher of spiders' eggs*!

Several other experimenters have supposed that they had succeeded in this new line of creation; but careful investigation has clearly proved that they had merely warmed into life the germs of pre-existing organisms.

So far, then, as science speaks at all on this subject, it says there is no such thing as spontaneous generation of organic beings, and sustains Harvey, that all living things came from germs or eggs, the products of parental beings—"Omne vivum ex ovo."

Science shows as clearly as it is possible to show a negative, that spontaneous generation is impossible, and that all animals sprang from germs of protoplasm, the products of pre-existing animals.

Science also clearly shows that there was a time when no animals did exist and when no one could exist on the earth—so hot was it.

Animals, therefore, come fairly within the range of causation, and are subject to all the Causes of Aristotle's category.

The first animal must have had a *Material Cause*, as science shows he was made of materials found in the earth; he must have had a *Formal Cause*, for science shows he has a special essence. He had a form, a structure, a life, and a mind different from all other beings. He had an *Efficient Cause* for his very existence proves there was some power capable of producing him; and as shown already, science has been able to find no sufficient power, or Efficient Cause in nature. The first animal must have had a *Final Cause*, for if there is any work of man or of God, which shows a design in the maker, that work is the animal. The animal, therefore, must have had an intelligent maker, with sufficient power to perform the work; and science has found no such maker but God.

The Bible is clear upon this subject: "God created great whales and every living creature that moveth."

IV. CHANGE OF SPECIES BY "NATURAL SELECTION."

The next stage in the Evolution Hypothesis, is the change of one species of animal into another: the speck of protoplasm into a protozoan; and the protozoan into higher animals, until man is evolved from the ape by the "Survival of the Fittest," or by "Natural Selection." All of the 500,000 species of animals which have lived upon the earth, were evolved out of the primordial animals. This is Darwinism, first distinctly promulgated by M. Maillet, a French novelist, about the middle of the last century.

At first view it would appear scarcely necessary to prove to any intelligent person that one species of animal is never changed into another, since no person has ever known such a change.

Man has known, and has been associated with animals, for many thousands of years, but he has never witnessed any such change; and indeed so firm was the belief in the permanency of species, that horses and the descendants of horses would always be horses, that a change into any other animal would have been deemed a miracle, and if I am not greatly mistaken, there is no one living who could believe that the progeny of a horse could be anything but a horse; and so certain are men of this, that the laws of all nations are based upon it; and upon the certainty of this principle, we fine, imprison and hang men and women. No jury, not even of Darwinians, would condemn a man to support an ape as his child, on any amount of testimony however positive. But yet, that man's progeny should sometimes be apes, is precisely what would happen, if man is descended from the ape; hence, the value which stock men place on pedigrees, for they know but too well that the bad qualities of a bad ancestor will sometimes appear even after many generations. So if man had had an ape for his ancestor we should expect the ape to appear in man's progeny by the laws of atavism.

But it is contended that the changes have come so gradually, that man has not noticed them.

But we know from ancient sculptures and paintings that the horse and many other animals are now precisely what they were forty and fifty centuries ago.

It is also said these changes took place in the vast geological ages.

But all the animals which lived in the geological ages, so far as we know, have been converted into rock, thus rendered as ever-

lasting as the hills and laid away in the rock strata in vast numbers. The crust of the earth, to the depth of many thousand feet, is a vast mausoleum of those animals which lived in the geological ages.

Here we have a perfect exhibit of all the extinct species known; we can trace them from the first to the last; but no species has yet been found to change into another species. Ten thousand men have been examining these species, more or less, for fifty years and yet no one has found a species that had changed into another.

The elephant that once lived in Missouri had no ancestors and he has left no posterity. The first was precisely like the last, and the same may be said of the mastodon and every other extinct fossil species.

Here in the rocks we have all the record known of the pre-historic times, but they have failed to give us any proof that one species has changed into another during all the geological ages.

V. WAS MAN EVOLVED?

If it were proved that all the species of animals, except man, were developed from other animals, the hypothesis would still lack demonstration, for

"From Nature's chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

Many evolutionists derive man from the ape, while others derive him from a hypothetical being between the ape and the man.

There is, however, not the least evidence that any such animal ever did exist; and since it is scarcely admissible to base hypothesis upon hypothesis in scientific inductions, we might logically dismiss all such derivations to the limbo of speculation and confine ourselves to the inquiry, whether man is a descendant of the ape.

Many arguments have been advanced in support of such descent. It is only necessary to examine the most important.

1st. "Apes look so much like men." "Are fearfully like men."

The resemblance is striking, and all the more so because the resemblance is not a close one. The ape is just enough like a man to call attention to the fact, and the contrasts in other features are so great and marked as to render the resemblance a broad and striking caricature. It is this likeness in part, contrasted with parts so unlike, that makes the caricature so striking.

2nd. "He can walk erect."

Yes, but he is a very awkward erect walker and seldom thus walks in a state of nature; but like the bear he sometimes meets his foes erect. The fact is the ape can neither stand or walk erect, not more naturally and steadily than a man can stand and walk on a rope, and it is perfectly certain man's feet were not designed for rope-walking, and quite as certain the ape's feet were not designed for erect walking.

3rd. "His physical structure is so like man's."

It is true his skeleton, muscles and nerves are very like man's, but those best qualified to decide this question, such as Owen and Huxley of England, Verchow of Germany, Cuvier of France, and Agassiz of America, all say positively the differences which are permanent in the bones, muscles and nerves are such as distinguish species and genera, and some are such as distinguish families and orders; so that man is properly put, not only in a distinct species and distinct genus, but even in a distinct order from the ape.

More than a hundred of these differences are pointed out, such as no degradation of the man or elevation of the ape can reconcile with the theory of descent. A few only can be mentioned:

a. They belong to different types. Species may change—types never. Man is terrestrial—walks and runs erect: apes are arboreal—climb and live in the trees.

The structures which fit them for these typical positions are marked. Man terrestrial has two hands for manual operations and two feet for walking; and the arboreal ape has four hands for climbing and no feet for walking. He also has long arms and a strong chest and pectoral muscles for swinging himself from tree to tree. Man's head is balanced erect on the spinal column; but the ape's is set too far forward for an erect position. Man's feet are at right angles to the leg; the ape's are turned in so he steps on their outer edges. They suit for climbing, but not for walking. Man's great toe is parallel with the others, and has strong tendons and muscles to support the weight in walking and dancing. The ape's is nearly at right angles to the other toes for grasping and climbing. These differences place the man and the ape in different types of structure. Typically the ape is nearer the sloth than the man.

b. The brain of the man is more than twice as large as that of the ape.

c. Man has vocal organs and can talk and sing; the ape has howling organs, and chatters and roars, but can utter no articulate sound.

d. Man laughs and smiles: the gorilla howls and grins.

e. Man has moral and religious natures; but the apes have no traces of either.

f. Man's pelvis is so horizontal as to support the abdominal viscera; while the pelvis of the ape is too perpendicular to perform any such service.

But, it is said, we must go back to the primitive man, who was nearer the ape. We have the histories of men for a long way back; and the traditions still farther back. These make the most ancient men our equals, if not our superiors. They were grand heroes and demigods according to these histories and traditions.

We have the skulls of men from their lake villages, their cave dwellings, their mound sepulchres, and the gravel beds of the late drift, and they are not inferior to the skulls of the present races of men; and the so-called Tertiary man was a full equal of ourselves in his physical structure.

We know the history of the apes, and the further we trace them back, the less are they like men; in fact the living ape and the living man are more alike than the fossil ape and the fossil man.

But Haeckel and Huxley say we must look for man's immediate ancestor in some undiscovered animal; but judging the unknown by the known, there must have been a long series of gradients between the ape and the man. The poodle is much more like the mastiff than the ape is like the man, and yet there are many gradients between the poodle and the mastiff. What has become of these gradients between the ape and the man? "All dead"! But the hypothesis, "Survival of the Fittest," that makes their existence necessary, makes it necessary that they should live longer than the ape. If he was not fitter to live than the ape, then he died and did not become the connecting link—the progenitor of man; but if he was fitter to live than the ape and become man's ancestor, he would survive the ape and be now living. Again, no descendant of the ape is now living, which is fitter to live than the ape, and consequently no such animal ever did live: and besides, if these numerous gradients between the ape and man ever did live, they must have left some remains, some traces of such existence; but no particle of such evidence has been found by all the thousands

who have been in search of such evidence in the tombs of the dead, amid the works of man and in the rock strata.

Such is the present condition of the scientific evidence of man's descent from the ape or some hypothetical animal; but the Bible is positive in the assertion that "God created man in His own image."

RECAPITULATION.

I. Whence came matter? The Bible says, by creation. Science indicates that atoms are manufactured.

II. How were worlds formed? The Bible says, God made them. Science has found no other solution.

III. How did plants and animals originate? The Bible says, God created them. Science finds no other origin.

IV. How did species originate? The Bible says, by creation. Science finds no other origin.

V. How did man originate? The Bible says, God created man. Science has found no answer but creation.

Such is the present state of knowledge on evolution.

GEO. C. SWALLOW.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It is instructive to know how the solemn facts of history often get a peculiar picturesque setting at certain turns, and are henceforth more easily remembered for such an association. It was a memorable morning, that morning last May in Bleeker street, New York City, when crowds besieged the doors of Thomas Nelson & Sons for the first issues of the long-expected Revision of King James' Version, and when the gamins shouted, in their zig-zag courses, "Ere's yer New Testament!" Nor will the journalistic enterprise be forgotten, which rapidly caught the electric transmissions of the Revision, and as rapidly committed them to the typal leaves that flew fast over this Western country, and were more eagerly read than the Sibylline messages for which Æneas anxiously waited. Few, indeed, were the towns of ten thousand inhabitants that did not soon have on sale the cheap edition of the wonderful work; and the busy buyers over the nation were in a week or two counted by the millions. These are the undeniable facts of interest—of popular interest—in the publication of the Revision. It was received, not only with scholarly eagerness, but with wide-spread popular curiosity and even enthusiasm.

But there are some other instructive facts, known to many of us, which must not be forgotten. They will sober us, and teach us a serious lesson. There were thousands of persons, counted intelligent, who knew little or nothing of the coming Revision. The rumors of its advent had been in the air for several years, and the fact of such an on-going work had got many a newspaper itemizing. But, after all, the majority of journalistic writers, and even of church-goers, knew little or nothing of what such an enterprise signified. They had little or no intellectual preparedness to receive it and to consider it. Many preachers did not have in their hands a copy until weeks and weeks after its publication. One popular minister in a collegiate town was heard to say, "I suppose it will be a good work to have on our tables for reference." Hundreds of preachers in the rural districts have never seen a copy, and do not

seem to be interested enough to procure one for examination. Many who have at last tasted its freshness, are yet like the disciples of the Baptist, preferring the old, and go on complacently using their King James' in the family and in the pulpit. Unless one has actually struck the instances, one will be surprised at the sheer ignorance of many as to the origin and transmission of the New Testament Scriptures. A city pastor was dumbfounded by the lament of one of his wealthy members, that "infidels should be thus tampering with the Word of God." Other men and women, counted equally intelligent, active in beneficences, readers of the weekly religious press, have hastily looked into the Revision, and immediately stumbled at the change of some pet passage. One old gentleman, celebrated in his neighborhood for his knowledge of history, read at Matt. 3:16, of Jesus going up straightway *from* the water," instead of "out of," and "that was enough" for him, as he straightway put the new book on his "index prohibitus."

These are the facts of popular ignorance that ought to be known and considered alongside the facts of popular interest. The people still perish for knowledge. There is no such thing yet as general popular intelligence. The intellectual men of society are still in the minority. There are railways and telegraphs and telephones; and newspapers and money-making and social ease; and—ignorance. The conspicuous proof, at present, of this ignorance is the way in which the popular mind has received and considered the Revision of the New Testament.

It will be seen, therefore, what a solemn duty rests upon all ministers and teachers of the Word in view of the advent of this Revision. They ought to be able to make an equitable decision, whether it is worthy of all acceptance or not—whether it ought to go before all other versions in the family, in the Sunday School, in the pulpit, or be laid on our tables as a work of occasional reference. For this Revision is either the greatest literary triumph or the most downright literary impudence of the nineteenth century. It cannot have a mere passing judgment; the judgment on it must be careful and serious. One will be prepared to make such a decision as one has also been preparing to receive the Revised Version. If one is an easy reader of New Testament Greek; if one is familiar with the mistakes of King James' Version, and familiar with scholarly corrections of them; if one has been in the habit of handling the long deposits of Biblical lore, critical, exegetical,

doctrinal; if one, finally, is posted on the everlasting difficulties of translating one language into another—then one need not be ashamed, in private and in public, to pronounce on the merits and the demerits of the Revised Version. Even with this intellectual preparedness, one's judgments should be slow. The New Testament has a great many verses in it; and a critic cannot exhaustively compare the old and the new version in a day or in a year. The most diligent students of the Greek are constantly coming across new phases and delicate shades of scriptural truth. Even they for many a month will be striking felicities or infelicities in the Revision. But the practical point is, can there be such a just decision at present as to approve or disapprove the use of this Version in the family, in the Sunday School, in the pulpit, as compared with the use of King James' Version? Let us proceed to such a study and decision—the study of the merits and demerits of the Revised Version, and a decision on them. And in this study let it be remembered that a large number of the readers of this *QUARTERLY REVIEW* will be laymen, for whom every writer ought so to digest his knowledge, and present it with such verbal clearness, that they will not feel cut off from reading the articles of the *REVIEW*.

It is becoming a popular fact that the Revisers had a great deal better text to use than King James' translators had. The long and serious study of the manuscripts of the New Testament, as they have been coming to light and to hand for many years, had yielded its harvest of accuracies, corrections, eliminations, and felicities, to the delight of the scholarly men who sat down ten years ago in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey for their notable work. This fact of superior opportunity is an immense one to begin with. Some day the people will get hold of it with its fascinating significance; and when they fully appreciate it, it will play no little part, I think, in persuading them to look on the Revised Version with a kindly, if not a favoring, eye. A great many of them do not know, for they have never stopped to consider, and, for that matter, they have never been told, that the New Testament had a hazardous journey down the ages, in writing instead of print. That word, "manuscripts"—the phrase, "best manuscripts," which some preachers use so glibly in the pulpit—is a dark word to many minds. You can do no better service to your congregation and to the public, in view of the advent of the

Revised Version, than to popularize the facts about the transmission of the Bible in manuscripts, to the age of printing, and the labors of a Mill, a Bengel, a Wetstein, a Griesbach, a Lachmann, a Tischendorf, a Tregelles, in settling, as far as possible, what a Luke, a Paul, a Peter actually wrote down in Greek two thousand years ago.

He ought, consequently, to tell the people that these scholars, in their life-long work, found more than a hundred thousand various readings in the texts of the New Testament; and then with numerous instances given on the blackboard, we ought to explain to them how these differences do not unsettle a single point of the faith or obscure an item of duty, and to confirm them in the thought, to quote Spinoza's noble language, that "Scripture, as far as it teaches what is necessary for obedience and salvation, cannot be corrupted." If they, the people, can get the hang of these facts and their significance; if they can gain even a superficial knowledge of the kinds of manuscripts, their names and their values, no little will be done towards making headway for understanding the necessity of a Revised Version, and the signal merits of the Canterbury Revision in this regard.

In this way the popular mind will not be chafing against the results of textual criticism, embodied in the Revised Version, with which students of the Greek have been long familiar. It is no surprise, indeed, even to many purely English readers, that the passage at 1 John 5:7, about the three heavenly witnesses, is omitted; nor that at 1 Tim. 3:16, we read "He" instead of "God;" nor that at Acts 8:37, the confession of the eunuch is left out. The facts about these passages have been brought to light long ago on account of controversial purposes. When once the light has so prevailed, but little objections to such omissions is ever heard.

It will go hard with many to give up the doxology in the Lord's Prayer. But their difficulty is a sentimental one, not a critical one. Alford's decisive words are: "The doxology must on every ground of sound criticism be omitted."

The Revisers have shown an admirable delicacy of criticism at John 7:53—8:1-11, the story of the woman taken in adultery. The criticism of that passage is a complicated one, as every student of the Greek well knows—one of the strongest passages of the New Testament, where external facts and internal evidence are brought into conflict. It is wanting in the oldest manuscripts, and in the

most ancient versions, and has no place in the expositions of such Greek fathers as Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. It has a place in certain best of the later manuscripts, and is mentioned by Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, the latter of whom warmly defends it as genuine.

But even where it is found in later important manuscripts, and other inferior ones, the variations of the text are serious. Over these textual difficulties, along with differences of opinion as to the weight of internal evidence, the best scholars are divided. The voice of scholarship, in view of textual facts, to say the least, will not decide in favor of its Johannean genuineness; but there is a manifest hesitation on the part of even the most adverse critics to regard it as unapostolic. The cool-headed Meyer says: "It entirely agrees with the tone of the Synoptical Gospels, and betrays not the least indication of a dogmatic or ecclesiastical reason which might account for its later invention." This statement of Meyer is a specimen of careful criticism, in view of the strong internal evidence for the genuineness of the passage. It sounds altogether like other parts of the Christian story—the account of the prodigal son, of the scene in Simon's house, of the dialogue by Jacob's well. Undoubtedly, the most reasonable view is to regard it, if not written by John, at least, as an apostolic relic. The *Revisers* could properly throw out the verse about the three heavenly witnesses; as to this passage, they could not have done better than to leave it in the text enclosed in brackets.

A still stronger proof of the judicalness of the *Revision*, as respects textual matters, is seen in the treatment of *Mat.* 16:9-20. The place of this passage in the text has been disputed. It is not found in the Sinaitic nor in the Vatican manuscripts, two of the standard and the oldest. It is disputed by Eusebius, Jerome, and Gregory of Nyssa, and different endings to Mark's Gospel are found in different manuscripts.

Moreover, its genuineness has been questioned on internal grounds. On the other hand, however, there is a positive quotation from the section—5:19—by Irenæus, more than a hundred years ahead of Eusebius, and the passage is found in three of the great uncial manuscripts, two of which date from the century after the two named above. The internal difficulties, it seems to me, are not of sufficient weight to bring the genuineness of the passage under suspicion.

The Revisers have shown their critical sagacity in not bracketing the section, but in leaving it to itself, with the simple foot-note, "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." The absence of brackets, in spite of the foot-note, well indicates that the evidence for the genuineness of the passage, as part of the apostolic tradition, if not written by Mark himself, is too serious for the passage to be rejected. The difference of treatment of this section from the treatment of the paragraph in John's testimony—the absence of brackets in the one, the use of them in the other—will be appreciated by all New Testament students, who diligently read between the lines.

There are many other textual novelties which might be mentioned, but which the careful reader must search out and mark for himself. Quite a number of these are corrections of the text, or additions to it, and give out a singular freshness of reading. At 1 Peter 2:1, 2, for instance, we read "that ye may grow thereby unto salvation." The added words, "unto salvation," sustained by many important manuscripts, among them the Sinaitic, make fine sense, and are in harmony with many other passages that point to the future salvation. In the same epistle, 4:16, instead of "let him glorify God in this behalf," we have, "in this name"—which shows that, whatever be the origin of the name "Christian," it certainly has a distinct divine approval. At Matt. 6:1, "Take heed that you do not your alms before men," instead of "alms," the Revision gives "righteousness." This change can be admirably used in a true exposition of the New Testament doctrine of righteousness. Rom. 5:1 is a crucial passage; and here the English and American Committees are divided. The English adopt the new reading, *ἔχωμεν*, subjunctive, "let us have peace," in a hortatory sense, the American scholars decide in favor of the old reading, *ἔχομεν*, indicative, "we have peace," declaring the result of justification. The hortatory form has the decisive weight on textual grounds. Prof. Schaff, one of the American Revisers, says, in *Lange on Revisions*, that this reading "has in its favor not only the overwhelming weight of ancient MSS., Versions, and Fathers, but also the critical canon, the more difficult reading is to be preferred."

Those who decide for the old reading, do so on internal grounds, chiefly from fear of legalistic tendencies involved in the exhortative as coming so abruptly on the doctrine of justification by

faith. Our English cousins, in their labors of Revision, have been charged with literary conservatism.

It is now in hand to charge our American brethren with doctrinal fears. The English Committee have boldly accepted the results of textual criticism on the passage. Any fears as to the weakening or contravention of the doctrine of justification by faith, in preferring the form, "let us have peace," can grow only out of certain perversions of Protestant theology, with which many of us are familiar. The change of reading at verse 3 will also be noticed. It is made on like textual grounds. A greater difficulty, truly, on internal grounds is found at 1 Cor. 15:49, where the Revision reads, "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." The textual authority for the subjunctive, *φορέσωμεν*, to quote one of the critics "seems absolutely decisive." It is not so overwhelming as on the passage in Romans; but it is heavily preponderant. It makes an abrupt change in the Apostle's teaching; but barring this fact, it yields excellent sense; and the Revisers, I think, would have done better to read the hortatory form in the text, "let us bear," and put the future in the margin.

From these imperfect remarks on the changes in the text, it will be seen how important just in one respect is this work of Revision. From these results there is no doubt that we get a surer hold on the meaning of evangelist and apostle. Our minds receive a wonderful stimulus in the study of God's Word; and we are shaken out of our lapses into Bibliolatry.

It is a mistake to think that popular confidence in the Bible will be dangerously affected by the knowledge of these textual uncertainties and variances. Not if the public teachers of the Word will take pains to instruct the people in regard to the origin and transmission of the New Testament. On the contrary, in view of all these differences, I think we shall all love our Bibles the more, and read them more eagerly, always keeping in mind those significant words of Spinoza: "The Scripture, as far as it teaches what is necessary for obedience and salvation, cannot be corrupted." This textual superiority of the Revision is one of its signal merits.

Passing to the consideration of the English dress of the Revision, one cannot help feeling disappointment that any of the obsolete words, or obsolete uses of words, should have been retained.

It is impossible, except on questionable grounds of expediency, to justify their retention. A story is going the rounds that the reprint of them had an advocate in the late Dean of Westminster, who, it is said, pleaded for the "innocent archaisms." Such a plea can only indicate how the best literary taste is liable at times to intellectual toying. Because certain *literati* read Spencer and Chaucer with delight, is no reason that archaisms in a translation of the Divine Word can have an innocent place. The English Revisers had, indeed, to give way on these obsolescences at 2 Cor. 8:1. We no longer read, "we do you to wit," but in good modern English, "we make known to you."

There is no reason in the world why all the changes to modern diction, suggested by the American Committee, should not have been adopted. Still I think these retentions are only literary blemishes, not critical defects.

As to the English dress of the revision in general I have seen certain passages pointed out as inferior to the readings of the old version in smoothness and beauty of style. But if you will examine these closely, you will frequently find that the excellence of style has been justly sacrificed to get more exactly at the original. In the Lord's Prayer, for instance, "thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven," is undoubtedly smoother than "thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth." But the latter is a more exact translation; and, after all, I think this exactness has a certain picturesque emphasis to which we shall soon become accustomed.

We have, indeed, been reading in Luke for a long time, "thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth." But after six months' constant use of the Revised Version, I cannot refrain from expressing my admiration of the innumerable felicities of translation which, I am satisfied, will soon be regarded and quoted as the best English. Consider this familiar verse: "But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing." It would be hard to improve the English of this, and be so faithful to the Greek. Take 1 Tim. 2:5, 6: "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." Here at once are emphasis and elegance of style. Better than "for which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish," is "wherefore we faint not, but though our outward man is decay-

ing." In the same chapter, 2 Cor. 5, the use of "absent" and "at home," as the English reader will see, as the Greek student will more clearly see, is ingenious and admirable. Taking passages almost at random, I light on Acts 16:25: "But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns unto God, and the prisoners were listening to them." King James's reading of this passage is cold and annalistic; the Revisers have made a picture of the fact, and yet stuck more closely to the original. Many have already called attention to the passage at Rev. 7:9-17. It is a remarkable one for accuracy of translation, especially as respects the use of the article and the tenses, and is fairly luminous in style. I have seen its freshness fall with fine effect on the hearts of a funeral circle. It is, I think, sober criticism to say that, barring certain abruptnesses of style, growing out of literal renderings of the Greek, the Revisers have beat the style of King James's Version. Parents and Sunday School teachers should not hesitate between the two in deciding which version the children shall memorize. Let them by all means learn the Revised Version.

With superiority of Greek text, with superiority of English style, the Revisers have, of course, given us modern instead of obsolete words, or obsolete uses of words, in critical passages. The English reader is no longer puzzled at Matt. 6:25. Instead of "take no thought," he reads "be not anxious." At Acts 21:15 it makes good sense to say, "we took up our baggage," instead of "our carriages." At 1 Cor. 4:4, "I know nothing by myself," was good English in 1611, as were the two passages of the King's Version just named; but "by" never now means "against," and so we read in the Revision, "I know nothing against myself." In the exhortation to unity at Eph. 4:1, 2, "endeavoring," which has become limited in its meaning since the appearance of the old version, gives way to its modern equivalent in the phrase, "giving diligence." "If any widow have children or nephews," at 1 Tim. 5:4, makes better sense with "grandchildren" instead of "nephews," as we so read in the Revision.

The treatment and use of the articles in the Revised Version will not fail to attract attention. The Greek student knows the difficulty of deciding where, and when not, to use the article in translation. He strikes, for instance, Matt. 3:13, ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην, and he will doubtless translate it with the Revisers, "from Galilee to the Jor-

don unto John." But whereas the definite article occurs in the Greek three times it is translated only once—before "Jordan"—and is omitted in English before "Galilee" and "John." It is simply a matter of idiom. The Greek tongue had some reason for such a use of the article that the English has not; and in this passage there is no loss in translation by the omission of the article before "Galilee" and "John." This passage is easy enough.

But turn to Rom. 1:17. Here the Revisers give "a righteousness," where the old version reads "the righteousness." But in the next verse the Revisers retain "the wrath," putting in the margin "a wrath." It seems to me that the justification of "the wrath" of verse 18 should be also the justification of "the righteousness" in the previous verse, as it is in the old version. There is no article in the Greek before either word. Whatever emphasis the Greek may have meant to avoid, or at least did not care for, by the omission of the article before both words, is not unduly brought out by the use of the article in the English.

But these two instances show the difficulty of the definite settlement that must appear in a translation or interpretation of the article into the English, or an elimination of it from the English. Indeed, the use of the word νόμος—"law," with and without the article, in these first chapters of Romans, show how hard it is to give this definite settlement as to the translation or incorporation or elimination of the article, as every one will testify who has waded among the different conclusions of the commentators. Sometimes translation cannot confidently fix the meaning of the original. In such cases interpretation, with its comparisons and shadings and paraphrases, is absolutely necessary to make the meaning plain.

Still there are numerous passages of the New Testament, where the article has an undoubted emphasis which should be done into English, but which the King's translators blindly passed by. These emphases are brought out in the Revision. It seems rather unnecessary, somewhat strained, to read, "For the life is more than the food, and the body than the raiment." The old version here is truer to the English idiom: "The life is more than meat and the body is more than raiment."

But the important passages are numerous where the translation of the article brings out the sense more clearly and emphatically. "The passover, the feast of the Jew," instead of "a feast," John 6: 4; "out of the great tribulation," instead of simply "great tribula-

tion," Rev. 7:14; "confessed the good confession," instead of "professed a good profession," 2 Tim. 6:12; "for the city which hath the foundations" instead of "a city" and simply "foundations," Heb. 11:10; "art thou the teacher of Israel?" instead of "a teacher,"—are specimens of happy revisions of the old version. The critical gain is immense in Rom. 5:15, 17, 18, 19, where the Revision brings out the meaning of the article, and also at 2 Thess. 2:3, 8. "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, * * * henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness," beats the old version.

The Revisers have done well, too, in omitting the article where it was needlessly present. At John 4:27, the disciples no longer marvel that Jesus "talked with the woman," but that he "was speaking with a woman." It was an unusual conversation, contrary to the rabbinical rule with its contempt for women in general. Another rather more important passage is at 1 Tim. 6:10, where "the love of money" is no longer "the root of all evil," but "a root." I dare say some sermons of the unlearned fathers, if not of some modern theological fledgelings, have been spoiled by this change.

There are immense gains over the old version in the rendering of prepositions. The English Committee have properly said in the margin, at Matt. 3:11, "baptize you with water," that "in" will do just as well; and the American Committee have told us that, in their opinion, "in" will do better, and that it and "with" should rather change places. "In" has been occupying the lower seat for many years, but its reward has at last come, and it is told to go up higher; while "with," who has for so long occupied the uppermost seat at this philological feast, is now sent to the foot. Let it be noted here, in all fairness, that the "out of" of King James' Version, verse 16, becomes in the Revision "from," its primary meaning. There is no use in anyone's kicking against the change; it is in accordance with lexical usage. But in the parallel passage in Mark 1:10, "out of" remains, because the Greek here is *ἐκ*, whose primary meaning is just that. The immersionist side of the controversy undoubtedly gains by the Revision. At Rom. 6:4 it is no longer "buried with him by baptism," but "through baptism," where the Revisers doubtless aim to elicit the involute instrumental sense of *ἐν*—"buried with him through baptism into death"—whereas at Col. 2:12, the spherul meaning of *ἐν* being upper-

most, they translate "having been buried with him in baptism."

I do not share the opinion of those who think that Christendom would be brought back to the one apostolic baptism, if this Canterbury Revision had printed "immerse" instead of "baptize." No one of the English or the American scholars who made the Revision, would hesitate to say, if asked, that βαπτίζειν means to immerse, and that the apostolic baptism was immersion. In all probability, the simple reason they did not translate the word, but left it as it was in the old version, is that they did not think it important enough to be made plainer. It was not their ignorance of the meaning of the verb; nor was it their cowardice, as some most wildly and ungraciously charge; it was simply their lack of appreciating the design of Christian baptism, that caused them to let "baptize" stand in the Revision.

When the people at large appreciate the design of Christian baptism—its Divine helpfulness of purpose to penitent believers; when, growing away from the prevalent Protestant confusion on the subject of conversion, they are no longer baffled by the very simplicity of the design, and come to understand the beautiful setting of such a positive institution in the Christian scheme of grace,—then they will have the testimony of church historians, doctors, commentators, and lexicographers, as to the action of the ordinance, and will be immersed. There is greater need to instruct Christendom in the beautiful simplicity of the design of Christian baptism, an institution neither sacramental nor ceremonial, in order to bring it back to the apostolic action, than to clamor for "immersion" in Revisions.

Let us also thank the Revisers for the correct translation of εἰς at Matt. 28:19, "baptizing them into the name," etc., and at 1 Cor. 1:13, 15. It is to be regretted that they did not allow this good sense also at 1 Cor. 10:2, where we read "baptized unto Moses," with "into" in the margin. At Acts 2:38, "unto the remission of sins" is much plainer than "for," as indicating the end aimed at or tendency towards. Luke 23:42 is no longer misleading. "Remember me when thou comest in Thy kingdom," not "into." The robber referred to that appearance of the Messiah in his kingdom, for which all the Jews were looking. I have heard of sermons on "Christian Simplicity," based on the old rendering, 2 Cor. 11:3, "the simplicity that is in Christ." Such sermons, with their exhortation to plainness of dress, of living, of worship,

are forever spoiled, so far as this passage is concerned, with its correct rendering of *εἰς*—"your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ." The apostle refers to the single-heartedness of the Christian toward Christ. I think the Revisers would have made the meaning plainer at Luke 16:8, the passage comparing the "sons of this world" with "the sons of the light," if, instead of "are for their own generation," they had read "toward." The preposition is *εἰς*, with its usual objective aim, and "for" is ambiguous, where "toward" is simple. The diligent reader of the Greek and the English may for hours thus trace the numerous corrections of prepositions which the Revisers have made. I presume we all have noticed the beauty of the well known exhortation, 2 Pet. 1:5-7, as it now appears with its "in your faith supply virtue; and in your virtue, knowledge," etc. The Christian graces are not tacked on to each other, but are organically developed.

An entire article could be profitably spent in the study and discussion of the corrections of the voices, moods, and tenses in the Revision. It has well been said that these changes do not unsettle one jot or tittle of Christian faith or duty. But there is one inherent change which will unsettle and then dissipate a long-fixed notion on the subject of salvation, as taught in Protestant revivals. I refer to Matt. 13:15, 18:3; Mark 4:12; Luke 22:31; John 12:40; Acts 3:19, 28:27, where the "be converted" of King James' Version, in the passive voice, becomes, in the Revision, "turn," or "turn again," in the active, the "again" being used not numerically, but intensively, to bring out the force of the preposition, *ἐντ*, in composition with the verb. Especially noteworthy is this change at Acts 3:19. "Be converted," as it is in the old version in all these passages, expresses a passive effect, something done to the sinner; "turn," or "turn again," as it is in the Revision, denotes an active movement, something that the sinner does.

The voice of scholarship will unanimously sustain these corrections; and in time they are bound to revolutionize the religious parlance of the subject. Instead of "when were you converted?" or "Who was converted yesterday?" we shall hear, "When did you turn?" and "Who turned last night?" The change lets in daylight amid the errors and confusions of modern revivals. It does not less imply the need and gracious presence of divine influences on the sinner's heart, as they flow through the channels of prayers,

sermons, songs, exhortations; but it teaches that conversion, or turning, is not a passive effect, something done to the sinner, but an active movement, something that the sinner does, not a catastrophe, but a process.

Another fine elucidation of a passage, in respect of voice, is at 2 Cor. 5:10. Instead of "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ," the Revision reads "we must all be made manifest." It is the searching exposure of our hearts and lives that the apostolic warning refers to.

Very important changes have been made in the tenses of the old version. Numerous are the passages where the force of the imperfect is correctly elicited. "Their net brake," becomes "nets were breaking," Luke 5:6; "and the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast," is changed to "John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting," at the time the complaint and the remonstrance were made to the Lord, Mark 2:18; "did not our heart burn within us," reads more graphically, "was not our heart burning within us," Luke 24:32; "now Peter and John went up together into the temple," is rendered more strikingly, "were going up into the temple," Acts 3:1.

Many like renderings of the imperfect will be noticed by the careful reader. The Revisers might have justly been thus particular at some other verses, where they let the simple past tense remain, although the Greek has the imperfect. At Luke 14:7, "when he marked how they chose out the chief seats," is bettered by "how they were choosing," as it pictures what was going on before the Master's eyes. While the grievous mistake of Acts 2:47 was receiving correction, it would have been well also to change "the Lord added" to "was adding." At Heb. 11:10 there is a fine sense of the imperfect, "he was looking for the city," etc., which the Revisers either overlooked or ignored. But their frequent elicitions of the imperfect are admirable indeed, and put the Revision away ahead of the old version in this respect. A correct translation of the present tense at Heb. 2:16 is given, and the entire sense altered. It is not, "he took not on him the nature of angels: but he took on him the seed of Abraham," as in the old version; but, "not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham," referring to those whom Christ delivers.

The proper force of the aorist tense is again and again brought out, where in the old version it was wrongly translated by another

tense. Rom. 6 is a notable chapter for this style of correction. "We who died to live," ver. 2; "we were buried," ver. 4; "was crucified," ver. 6; "if we died," ver. 8; all these changes bring out the Greek in a clearer light. So, too, in Col. 2, we have "ye were also circumcised," ver. 11; "ye were also raised," ver. 12; "if ye died," ver. 20; and in Col. 3, "if then ye were raised," ver. 1; "for ye died," ver. 3; all of which corrections better express the apostolic doctrine of that definite time and act when one dies to live, and becomes alive to righteousness—the definite act, from which issue the inspirations for all betterment of character and life. This wholesome doctrine of grace has a like improvement of translation at Gal. 3:27, "for as many of you as were baptized into Christ did not put on Christ;" at Eph. 1:11, "in whom also we were made a heritage," 2:5, 6, "quickened us," "raised us;" and at many other places. One slip in this line of corrections the Revisers made at Gal. 5:24, where "have crucified" should by all means be the simple past, "crucified." But they did not nod at 2 Cor. 5:14, where the improvement is seen at once in all its beautiful emphasis—"because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died"—the aorist again, expressing the virtual death of the race in Christ's death. The unique Christian doctrine of salvation by grace, gains immensely in expression by the Revision.

The perfect tense has also got its rights at the hands of the Revisers. At 1 Cor. 15:14, where the old version translated the perfect by the aorist, "he rose," the Revisers translate literally "hath been raised," and so in verses 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20. But from 5:13 on, the old version gives one of the well known uses of the perfect, "is risen," "is raised," which expresses the apostolic notion of a continuously living Christ; and it is a little hard to decide just here which version has the better of it. "Hath been raised," of the Revision, is exact and positive; "is risen," also correct, but not so positive, is more poetic and melodious. The Revisers make this latter use of the perfect in John's 1st Epistle, 2:29; 3:9 4:12; 5:1, etc. 2 Cor. 12:2, 3, becomes clearer by this correct rendering of the perfect—"I know a man," etc. A nice distinction between the aorist and the perfect, lost in the old version, is seen in the Revision at Col. 1:16.

The corrections of the mistakes of King James's Version would alone make the Revised Version the more valuable one. The Revisers have searched these out with diligence, and it will

take repeated readings of their Revision to appreciate these vast improvements. We have noticed some of these corrections as to the article, prepositions, and voices and tenses of verbs. The adjectives, adverbs, nouns and pronouns come in for valuable changes. At Gal. 1:6, the English reader can see at once the Apostle's meaning in the phrase, not "another gospel," but "a different (*ἕτερον*) gospel," as the Revision correctly has it; and the next sentence is consequently not so obscure, "which is not another (*ἄλλο*) gospel." This statement has had a sad abuse in its application to those at the present time, who do not really preach a gospel contrary to Paul's, but in preaching the same gospel, do not preach it fully. "Now John himself;" Matt. 3:4, sets the verse in better relation to ver. 3 than does "the same John."

It is disappointing that at Acts 17:22 the Revisers did not omit "superstitions," and substitute their marginal reading, "religious," whether or not we then read "somewhat religious," with the English Committee, or "very religious," with the American. "Superstitious" does injustice to Paul's delicacy of feeling and masterly tact, so evident in the rest of his speech, and just the thing to conciliate his hearers. And "ye worship in ignorance" is better changed to the softer "worship without knowing." "In nothing be anxious," Phil. 4:6, is better than "be careful for nothing," the reading of the old version. In ver. 8 the "honest" of the old version gives way to "honorable," a little tainted to American noses, but really an admirable and ingenious translation of *σεμνά*.

A few of the better renderings of nouns may here be noticed. At Phil. 3:20, 21, it is no longer our "conversation," but our "citizenship," which "is in heaven;" and it is not "change our vile body," but "fashion anew the body of our humiliation." The Revisers have done well to stick to the genitive cases in a good many places, where the old version diluted them into adjectives. We now read "the body of his glory," Phil. 3:21; "the liberty of the glory of the children of God," Romans 8:22; "the gospel of the glory," 1 Tim. 1:11; "the mind of the flesh," "the mind of the spirit," Rom. 8:6; "fountains of water of life." All these renderings are literal, fresh, and impressive.

The Revisers have given us many changes which may be termed philological niceties. An important one is found at Rom. 3:25, "to show his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime." The old version has "remission." But

the Greek is not ἄφεσις, the standard word for "remission," but πάρεσις, used only here. "Passing over" expresses its sense; "remission" is too strong. God "passed over the sins done aforetime," did not call them at once to account, but afterwards in the death of His Son, by which His righteousness for such forbearance was to have its exhibition. Rom. 12:2 furnishes a beautiful distinction of words—"be not fashioned" and "be transformed," the first, *συσχηματίζεσθε*, referring rather to more outward style; the second, *μεταμορφοῦσθε*, exhorting to a more radical change, the change of mind and heart. At Gal. 1:18, "I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas," the force of *ἱστορῆσαι* is elicited. At John 21:16, it is not feed my sheep," but "tend," by which the Revisers difference *ποιμαίνω* from the *βόσχω* of verses 15 and 17. But alas! the two different words for love in this paragraph—*ἀγαπῶ* and *φιλῶ*—cannot have a distinctive expression in English without a paraphrase. It is cold comfort to the English readers for the Revisers just to tell him that "love in these places represents two different Greek words."

Once more, let us notice the felicity of translation at Phil. 4:12—"in everything and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want." The verb is *μεμύημαί*, the word of initiation into the heathen mysteries, elegantly rendered by "have learned the secret." There are other verses which the Revisers might have made to yield their treasures; but for what they have taken pains to give us in this way, we owe them our sincere thanks.

The Revision is, of course, open to criticisms. It is not perfect. It is a herculean task to translate a work like the New Testament; it is no less arduous to revise a translation of it like King James's. We all, no doubt, hear with admiration what great pains the Revisers have taken in their noble task—the length of time they have taken, the strictness of procedure they imposed on themselves, the devotion with which they prosecuted their duties. But it would be strange indeed if the eye never grew weary, and their attention never once flagged. The weakness of the flesh never fails to lower the attainments of a great work; and when to this you add helpless fallibility in spite of light, and honest differences of opinion, and pride of conviction, from which the saintliest are not free, it ought not to surprise any one that this Revised Version still needs revising.

This leads us to consider the important recommendations of the American Committee. There they are, bound up with the Revision, and they cannot be ignored. The voices of such scholars as Schaff, Woolsey, Abbot, Crosby, Riddle, will be heard in America, not because they are Americans, but because their scholarship is international in name. Turning, therefore, to the appendix, one, on the first page, is struck at once by the eminent correctness, the eminent desirableness of their preferred readings and renderings. Their first recommendation is to "strike out S. (i. e. Saint) from the title of the Gospels and from the heading of the pages." The application of this word to a Matthew or a Paul is bad as a piece of ecclesiastical tawdriness and scripture perversion, and still worse as a literary blemish.

Let it go. Many who approve this first recommendation, may not so promptly acquiesce in the first part of the second, viz.: to strike out "the Apostle" from the title of the Pauline Epistles; but surely the time has come for us to quit saying "the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews," when no one can pronounce with any confidence that Paul wrote that letter. The dropping of "General" from the titles of the Epistles of James, Peter, etc., is simply the elision of an ecclesiastical excrescence; and "the Revelation of John" is much clearer and more impressive than "the Revelation of S. John the Divine," saint and seer though he was. The third recommendation to adopt uniformly "Holy Spirit" for "Holy Ghost" is a deep gash into the liturgies of the English Church. There will have to be a revision of her prayers, chants, and doxologies, before this recommendation can make any headway in England. The fourth item is a bold recommendation, not as to a rendering, but as to a marginal explanation, which the majority of commentators have already given. The fifth is meant to secure consistency in the translation of the preposition, *διά*, when it relates to prophecy—the uniform use of "through" instead of "by," certainly more expressive of the Greek than "by." The sixth is meant to elicit the distinction which certainly obtains between the words "tempt" and "try" in the passages named. The seventh hits the Dean of Westminster's "innocent archaisms" their proper death-blow. The distinction between "devil" and "demon" had already been pointed out by scholars of the English Committee; and our American brethren simply take them at their word. The American Committee simply prefer philological correctness to ecclesiastical usage

in telling us to put "in" after "baptize" instead of "with."

But they missed it, after recommending the change everywhere of "testament" to "covenant," in making Heb. 9:15-17 an exception. The use of "covenant" in this passage is, I think, the only way to make sense out of it. "Steadfastness" in the margin is an admirable side-light, where "patience" is in the text; the exceptions are properly named. It is confessedly more faithful to the Greek to read "penny" for "farthing" at Matt. 10:29 and Luke 20:24, where, as the committee well judge, the name of the coin, not its value, is on the top of our Lord's mind.

The thirteenth recommendation involves minute criticisms, with good scholars on either side; but the difference of opinion, while not of great importance, is worthy of marginal note. The excellence of the last suggestion is well proved, by the substitution of "supply" for "fulfil" at Phil. 4:19.

It may be said, partly in answer to the failure of the English Committee to accede to these demands, that their first rule was "to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text, consistently with faithfulness." But this adjourns the question farther back. It may then be justly asked, but what about the rule—was that right and proper? It may be true that the sight of "S." before Matthew ought not to give one the doctrinal shivers; and that the children of the public schools soon learn from their primary rhetorics that "wist" means "know;" and that "devil" for "demon" will not corrupt one's scriptural knowledge. But the fact remains that the majority of the Americans are ready for scriptural cleanness, and scriptural correctness, whether the English people are ready or not.

Let us not tauntingly speak of "British conservatism." Let us remember that a nation's conservatism is often a vital habit, bound up as it is with numerous serious individual convictions and age-long social customs. Let us not forget this in regard to our mother country, where church and state seem so fast joined. Many a ritualist and high-churchman has published abroad his scorn of the Revision, even with its English committee's concessions; he would doubtless take hold of Dr. Hitchcock's American edition with a pair of tongs, and fling it into the fire. I doubt if the Revised Version can win its way surely into English favor except on the legs of the concessions which the English Committee have made. I should be willing to say nothing but "Holy Ghost" in

every cathedral and meeting-house of England, if I should be allowed to preach there on "Conversion according to the Revised Version."

But, on the other hand, our English cousins must not be surprised at our American progressiveness. America has no conservatism that will stand long in the way of receiving the truth. The American Committee are truly our representatives as regards any advance to a clearer and correcter expression of scriptural doctrine.

But as to accepting all the recommendations of the American Committee—as to taking our Revised Versions, and reading wholesale into the text their preferences from Matthew to Revelation—here there must be a pause. Such an edition has been published in this country, all of the American Committee's readings going into the text, and all the English Committee's differences from these retiring to the appendix. And we have all been urgently advised, in buying our copy, to give the preference by all means to the "American Revised Version." But this advice is absurdly indiscriminate.

We have seen, indeed, that the first fourteen recommendations of the American scholars, with two or three exceptions are admirable and worthy of all acceptance. But when it comes to the differences of text and translation, there will necessarily be a wide division of judgment as to which is correct. Here again it will require long and patient examination for one to come to an intelligent decision. For myself, I confess that, so far as I have examined the American Committee's readings, I find them superior in excellence and number to the readings of the English Company. And yet I find passages of importance—some of great importance—where, in my opinion, the English side has the better of it. The American Revisers, we have seen above, cling to the old reading at Rom. 5:1, where the textual authority for the change made by the English scholars is, to quote Schaff again, "overwhelming." To refer to a minor difference, at Luke 8:33, the Revisers left the "were choked" of the old version, the literal meaning of the Greek *ἀπενίην*, which the American Company change to "drowned." This is hypercritical. At Acts 2:47, "those that were being saved" is a literal translation of *τοὺς σωζομένους*, and the idea of it—the progressiveness of salvation—is decidedly consonant with other scriptures. In the "those that were saved" of the American preference, this

idea may be microscopically seen; but the English rendering, if not so smooth, is better expressive of the Greek, and is therefore preferable. 1 Cor. 2:13 is hard to translate and hard to interpret. The English scholars leave the old reading, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual," with "combining" in the margin for "comparing," and a second reading "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men;" while the American Revisers decide on "combining spiritual things with spiritual words."

But in the latter rendering, is "continuing," in the bare sense of associating or connecting, an exact translation of *συνκρίνωτες*? Is not the discriminative element of the participle too much lost sight of?

As to "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men," the 14th verse gives some justification for this rendering, as the American translation can look back for favor to the first part of verse 13. Still another rendering is possible—"comparing spiritual things with spiritual standards," just as we judge mathematical things by mathematical rules, and æsthetic matters by æsthetic rules. At any rate, I think the American Revisers have been a little too bold in reading their interpretation into the text. Again, at 1 Peter 1:7, we read in the English Revision, "and in your godliness love of the brethren; and in your love of the brethren love." This is true to the Greek, and, I think, fairly Homeric in its mellifluous play. But the genius of American scholarship restores the old-fashioned "brotherly kindness," and remands this felicity to the margin.

The change at 1 Tim. 2:4 will not escape notice. The ambiguous "who will have all men to be saved" of the old version, gives way, in the English judgment, to the literal and exact "who willeth that all men should be saved," but becomes, in the American preference, "who would have all men to be saved." There is an evident coldness about this rendering not justified by the Greek, a weakening of the sense of the English Revision, which no doctrinal view, (if I am not unjustly suspicious) should allow.

So, I repeat, it is absurd to advise persons to buy the American Revision in preference to the English, with what this implies of wholesale and indiscriminate acceptance of their readings and renderings. As to their recommendations about archaisms and obsolescences, these will meet with well-nigh universal approval in America. But these changes are not near of the same importance

as the differences of textual readings and translations when we begin to study their record in Matthew and go book by book through the New Testament.

I say again that, in my judgment, so far as I have examined these differences, the American side has the superiority in excellence and numbers. But I have pointed out, I think, some important passages where the English side has the better of it. And these are not the only passages where it has the better of it. And besides, there are passages where, in my opinion, there can never be an absolute decision, and where one side is about as good as the other.

Nothing but time and patient study can bring criticism to a complete pronouncement of the value of the two Revisions, if we must thus speak of two. Meanwhile, it is a serious question whether we are to have rival editions, as respects their corporate reception and use. The competent student would just as soon have one as the other, as he can use either intelligently, correcting one by the other. But it is a different matter where you come to consider the use of translations of the Scriptures corporately in church or Sunday School. You are bound to settle on one for corporate use in such places. The final verdict, I think, will favor the American Revision above the English; but that verdict is yet a suspended one, and may not drop its weight, so as to be generally felt, for a long time; and in the meantime the English Revision has got millions of receptions the start. The most practical method I know of (to come abruptly to a decision), is to use the admirable edition of Harper Brothers, which has all of the American recommendations on the same page with the English Revision, where one, therefore, can constantly note and become familiar with the differences.

We thus avoid the inconvenience of rival separate editions, while all the time the people are being educated up to the superiorities of the American Revision. And so the time may come when English-speaking Christendom will have accepted the American Revision, because purged of archaisms and obsolescences and other conservatisms (I question if a rival edition would ever have been thought of but for these), and, because of this timely progressiveness, will henceforth read the Revised Version with the English differences and translation in the margin.

As to the superiority of the Revised Version or King James's,

the Revision, in the judgment of all competent critics, has, I think, the favorable verdict. The use of a better text, to begin with, and the correction of the thousands of mistakes of the old version, make at once for this favorable decision. The perfect translation of the New Testament is yet a work of the future. One thing, however, is certain—there will never be, what some are asking for, an entirely new translation that will gain either the wide scholarly approval or general corporate acceptance that this Revision will finally get. The perfect translation of the future will simply be a further revision of the present Revised Version—a fact that speaks volumes for its correctness and admirableness. Let it, by all means, be constantly used in the pulpit, in the Sunday School, and by the fireside. “The Scripture,” to quote Spinoza once more, “as far as it contains what is necessary for obedience and salvation, cannot be corrupted.” But the Revised Version, with its corrections of corruptions and mistakes, will make one’s obedience more delightful, one’s salvation more enjoyable.

ROBERT T. MATHEWS.

THE EDUCATION OF PREACHERS.

From the time that Bethany College was founded, about forty years ago, there has been among the Disciples an urgent and increasing demand for a supply of well educated preachers. That College met with public favor and obtained a partial endowment, chiefly because of its promise to meet this demand. The still greater endowment of Kentucky University, and the original endowment of Butler University were obtained chiefly on the same plea; and there is perhaps no College among us which does not owe its existence to this cause.

But while we have persistently clamored for an educated ministry, we have never yet settled upon any standard of attainments by which the education in question shall be tested. The liberty which we enjoy in Christ forbids the erection of an unchangeable standard by which men shall be allowed or not to preach the gospel, but when we undertake to educate men for the work, we ought certainly to fix some standard which shall serve as at least the minimum of attainments entitling one to the distinction of an educated preacher. This subject demands, I think, more attention at our hands than it has hitherto received.

In seeking to fix, at least approximately, such a standard, the first question that presents itself is this: Shall the education be special, or only general? Shall the young preacher, in other words, be content with a general education in literature and the sciences, such as entitles him to the degree of Bachelor of Arts, before he enters fully upon his work, or shall he deem a special course of study in his chosen department indispensable? In the earlier history of our colleges the former idea prevailed. There was no instruction provided for the prospective preacher except that which was imparted to other students. But within the last sixteen years, a special course for preachers has been provided, and the new order of things was inaugurated by the organization of the College of the Bible in Kentucky University. This change was demanded by the dictates of common sense, and by both the precedents and the

precepts of the Scriptures. Though a man should possess all other learning, but be unacquainted with law, no one would entrust to his management an important case in court; and though one should be familiar with all other science, but not with medicine, no sensible man would allow him to treat a sick child. Why, then, should a man who has been trained in secular literature and science, be allowed to preach and teach in the church of God, unless he be also instructed in the word which he is to preach? Common sense forbids it with an emphasis greater than in the other instances mentioned, inasmuch as the care of souls is greater than the care of our bodies. And this which common sense forbids is likewise forbidden in the Scriptures. The public ministry of Jesus was devoted much less to preaching in the presence of the multitudes, than to teaching the twelve apostles. He kept these twelve men in a peripatetic school for three and a half years and he was in a very exclusive sense what he so often called himself, *their teacher*. During this period, although he allowed them to go forth for awhile and preach the very simple announcement that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, he more than once forbade them to preach him to the people until after his resurrection from the dead. (See Matthew 16:20; 17:9.) He kept them thus at school, notwithstanding the fact that they were yet to be inspired; and it was not until the Holy Spirit came upon them that the seal upon their lips was finally broken. In like manner, while Paul was traveling from place to place as required by his commission, he was ever attended by groups of younger men such as Timothy, Titus, Tychicus, Trophimus, Demas, Artemas, and others, whom he instructed and sent out upon various temporary missions. After he had given much oral instruction to Timothy, on leaving him at Ephesus with new and untried responsibilities, he wrote him an epistle for the expressed purpose of giving him further instruction, saying: "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come to thee shortly, but if I tarry long, that thou mightest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim., 3:14, 15.) Finally, when Paul was about to leave the world, he writes to Timothy another letter, in which he gives orders in the following words for the instruction of future teachers in the church: "The things which thou hast learned of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be

able to teach others also." (2 Tim., 2:2.) There the class of men to be selected is pointed out, "faithful men;" their course of instruction is prescribed, all that Paul had taught; and the purpose for which they were to be selected and taught is stated, that they might be "able to teach others." The instruction did not make them teachers, it only made them "able to teach" when called to this work by their brethren.

There is strong reason to believe that a course similar to this was pursued by the prophets of the Old Testament period. From the days of Samuel forward there were companies of men called prophets, and "sons of the prophets," who lived together in communities at Rome, Bethel, Jericho, Gilgal, and other places, sometimes as many as one hundred in a company. (1 Sam. 10:5-11; 19:18-20; 2 Kings, 2:3, 5, 7; 4:38-44.) From among these the special prophets of God were usually called, as appears from the remark of Amos, who, to show that he had not sought the office, but was an exception to the rule, says: "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was a herdsman, and a gatherer of Sycamore fruit, and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said to me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel." (Amos 7:14-15.) These companies are usually called by scholars, "schools of the prophets," and it appears that they spent their time in study and religious exercises, preparing themselves for any good work to which they might be called. One of their number was sent to rebuke Jehoshaphat, (1 Kings, 20:35-43,) and another to anoint John. (2 Kings, 9:1-3.) Samuel presided over these companies, (1 Sam. 19:20,) and as they first appear during the period of his judgeship, it is presumed that he founded them.

From the foregoing we see that it is both wise and scriptural to provide for those who would preach and teach in the church a course of instruction especially adapted to their work; and now the question arises, in what should that course of instruction consist? We propose to inquire for the minimum of such a course, and not for its maximum; for we think it prudent to determine the least that should be prescribed, before we think of extending the course to the greatest limit which might be found advisable. We are to be guided in this inquiry by considering what is necessary to safety and efficiency in the preacher's work. A sufficient amount of special education to render him safe in his expositions of the Scriptures, and efficient in persuading both saints and sinners, is the least with which he should begin.

For the former of these purposes, I would prescribe, first of all, a thorough course of sacred history. By this I mean, a familiar acquaintance with all of the historical books of the Bible, and a knowledge of all the chief historical matter contained in the other books. Facts lie at the foundation of all knowledge, and they are safeguards against all forms of error. In preaching and teaching, Jesus and the Apostles made constant use of Old Testament history, and the errorists of their day were never so effectively refuted as by an appeal to familiar facts recorded in the sacred books. He who is well posted in these historical details can scarcely go far astray in his interpretations of the precepts and teachings of Jesus and the apostles. He is at the same time furnished with a vast amount of most valuable material for instruction and illustration. If a man can do no more than to correctly recite to the people the facts of sacred history, he can do them an invaluable service, and he will always be heard with gladness. It is true also that there is no department of study better calculated to strengthen and settle a student's faith than such an investigation of the actual facts of Scripture as enables him to appreciate them at their true value, and to handle them as realities. We hold, then, that no preacher can be regarded as properly educated for his work, who is not familiar with every portion of sacred history; so familiar with it that he can promptly and correctly state from memory all the prominent incidents in every book, and can readily perceive their bearings on the doctrine and practice of the church.

To acquire such a knowledge of the Scriptures is no easy task. It requires a sound judgment, a good memory, a capacity for classification, and years of study. The only institution known to the writer in which it is attempted, is the College of the Bible; and in this it requires a daily recitation for four years with results only partially satisfactory. It must be regarded as a very serious defect in the theological seminaries of the country, that notwithstanding their rich endowments and their numerous professors, they have paid but little attention to this fundamental branch of study. I am glad to have evidence that some of their friends are beginning to wake up to the importance of it. The *Central Presbyterian* has recently published a stirring editorial on the importance of the "Direct Study of the Bible in the Seminaries," and it is copied with approval in the *Sunday Magazine*. I wish I could lay the whole of it before the readers of the QUARTERLY REVIEW, but I must

content myself with quoting a few words, from which the drift of the article can be gathered: "The direct study of the Scriptures does not receive that supreme attention in preparing for the ministry which it deserves. * * * Exposition is entitled to the highest place in the student's estimation. * * * To expound the Scriptures is the great work of the preacher; to prepare to do this is the great work of the theological student."

Next to sacred history in importance, is the department of hermeneutics and exegesis, to which, as well as to sacred history, the words just quoted have reference. There are certain fixed laws of thought, by which all human speech is interpreted; and without a knowledge of these it is impossible for a preacher to be safe in his interpretations of Scripture. It is not sufficient that he receive instruction in the laws of hermeneutics, and commit to memory the rules of exegesis; he must be drilled in the application of the latter until he can be safely trusted to make some progress by his own exertions. In no department is a teacher a greater necessity; for in none is the unaided student, or the student aided by books alone, more liable to serious mistakes. If ignorance of sacred history among preachers is alarmingly prevalent, crude and even shocking expositions of Scripture are still more so. No one should be considered competent to teach the Word of God until he has become to such a degree familiar with the didactic portions of the New Testament that he is ready at all times to give an intelligible and consistent exposition of all passages in them except the few which are confessedly obscure. To attain to this requires much labor combined with native talent; and the single year which is usually assigned to it is scarcely sufficient.

Besides a good knowledge of sacred history and a sufficient drill in exegesis, the young preacher must also have a systematic knowledge of those topics which are included under the general heads of doctrine and discipline. He should know correctly the distinction between the dispensations, and the relations thereto of the different parts of Scripture; he should know the Scripture teaching in regard to sin and its punishment, and in regard to the Redeemer and the redemption effected by him; he should understand the conditions of pardon for both saint and sinner; and he should know what the Scriptures teach in reference to the organization, the edification, the discipline and the extension of the church. These are the topics usually included under the head of

Systematic Theology in the seminaries, and in these schools they have usurped a pre-eminence to which they are not entitled. It is because of this, as well as because of the unscriptural teaching on these topics in the seminaries, that those among the Disciples who have understood the subject have made war upon these institutions; and it is in this department chiefly that young men are liable to be misled by their teachers when the teachers themselves have been erroneously taught. This danger can be reduced to its minimum, and the desired instruction imparted in the most effective way, by making the study of these topics a part of the course in exegesis, and by requiring the student to lead in the investigation, instead of being led by his professor. The time required for this work, after a proper drill in exegesis, would be comparatively brief.

Another indispensable department in such a course of instruction as we contemplate, is that of Evidences. A man may be a believer, settled and immovable, without being able to give a logical reason for the faith that is in him; but no one is fitted to be a proclaimer and defender of the faith who is not prepared to meet the foes whom he is certain to encounter. Infidelity is increasing in boldness and in the number of its advocates; and it is multiplying the weapons of its warfare. In many communities of our country, especially in the North and the West, it is the chief obstacle to the success of the gospel. No man should be regarded as properly educated for the preacher's work, unless he has an appreciative knowledge of those positive grounds of evidence on which the Christian faith has ever depended, and is able to successfully refute at least that class of objections which constitute the common stock of infidel speakers and writers. Indeed, this branch of study should be an essential part of the curriculum in every college pretending to be christian in its general character, and especially in those colleges established and sustained by religious people. It is to be feared that it has of late sunk into neglect in many of our American colleges, while the negative forms of infidelity and atheism have taken possession of the chairs of physics and natural history. Let the founders and supporters of colleges watch this point with sleepless vigilance; for the difference between sending forth from our colleges an army of educated young infidels, and the same number of educated young believers, is the difference between the triumph of infidelity or of faith in the succeeding generation.

But the young preacher, with any amount of information, and of skill in exegesis, will find himself greatly at a loss how to embody his thoughts on any given topic or passage of Scripture in the form of a discourse, unless he has had some special training with this in view. The structure of a discourse is as definite an art as sculpture or painting; and although, as in those two arts, an unaided student with superior genius, may accomplish wonders, yet he must do so after many blunders and after long continued efforts which can be shortened by the aid of a teacher. Indeed, the work of the self-taught artist, like that of the self-made preacher, will always be marred by defects which a little instruction would have prevented. True, this preacher and this artist are likely to be ignorant of these defects,—their very want of instruction leaves them so,—but to the eyes of others they are sufficiently apparent. And while a genius may accomplish much without help, a teacher is a necessity to the student of ordinary capacity.

There is a class of preachers utterly void of system in their methods of thinking and speaking, as completely so as some men are of the conception of tune and time, and these are never puzzled in regard to the structure of their sermons, from the simple fact that their sermons have no structure—they are merely a jumbling together of heterogeneous ideas. But I speak the common experience of all systematic thinkers when I say, that one of the most puzzling and distracting tasks of an inexperienced preacher, is the putting together of his ideas on a subject, or his thoughts of a text, in such a discourse as shall have beginning, middle and end, and progress all the way through. To such, the value of a little instruction and training is beyond estimate; and he alone can even partially estimate it who has received this instruction after struggling for a few years without it. To him it is as refreshing as light to one who has long been groping in darkness. A course of Homiletics, then, or the application of the rules of rhetoric to the composition and structure of religious discourses, is the crowning necessity in the preparatory instruction of a preacher.

The departments thus far mentioned include, or should be made to include all that may be called the special preparatory instruction of a preacher, with the exception of Ecclesiastical History, and the critical study of the Scriptures in the original Hebrew and Greek. The former of these subjects is now so extensive, that a compendium of it suitable for class-room instruction is

almost impossible, and it is so little needed in order to the successful beginning of the preacher's work, that it may be safely left for his private reading during many years of his active life. A general knowledge of it is indispensable to the preacher's greatest usefulness, but it is doubtful whether any of it should be included in the minimum of his preparatory course. As for the original languages, they cannot, of course, be applied to the study of the Scriptures unless a knowledge of them has been previously acquired, and whether this knowledge shall be demanded depends upon the answer to another question which must now be introduced—the question, how much of the usual college curriculum shall be included in the preacher's preparation for his special course.

In the majority of the theological seminaries no one can matriculate who has not obtained the degree of Bachelor of Arts or its equivalent; but many of these institutions have relaxed this rule, once universal, or have introduced a shorter course which can be pursued without a knowledge of the classics and the sciences. It would certainly be well for every preacher to enter upon his work with all the culture implied in the bachelor's degree, and some of it he must have before he can successfully prosecute those departments of his own special course insisted on above. He must have a thorough knowledge of English Grammar before he can properly commence the study of sacred history, and a knowledge of rhetoric and logic should precede the study of hermeneutics, homiletics and evidences. Some knowledge of science would also largely contribute to the prosecution of these studies, and the culture derived from the study of the classic tongues is really necessary to the highest attainments in these departments. Unquestionably, then, the student should be encouraged, when time and circumstances admit, to acquire all. But this leaves the question still unsettled, how much of the college curriculum shall be held as indispensable to the minimum of a preacher's preparation. The obvious answer expressed in general terms, is this, that so much of it should be required as is necessary to respectable attainments in the preacher's especial course; and in particular, experience has demonstrated that for this end a knowledge of rhetoric, logic, English literature, and mental philosophy is sufficient. I will not pause to defend this last statement farther than to say, that some of the most successful and acceptable of the younger class of preachers now in the field are those who have pursued only this course, and that they compare

favorably as mere preachers with those of the same experience, with higher attainments.

If these remarks are correct, it follows, that we should have a shorter course, including only the studies just named, in addition to the preacher's course proper, and a longer course, including the entire college curriculum. A student who has time and means should pursue both courses, and all should be encouraged to pursue all that time and means will allow. No arbitrary policy can be wisely prescribed, but we must submit ourselves to circumstances, and these are at present unfavorable. Such is the state of primary education in this country, especially in the West and South, that many youths grow up to manhood with almost no education, and when it enters their minds and hearts to give themselves to the gospel their education has yet to be begun, while poverty throws almost insuperable barriers in their way. Such also is the state of religion among the more favored classes, that youths who enjoy the educational advantages which wealth procures, are disinclined to be preachers, or are dissuaded from it by their parents. As a consequence, the mass of young men who seek an education for the purpose of preaching are compelled by poverty and the increase of years to attempt only the briefer course of study, and to fall short of completing even this.

There is still another reason for providing the shorter course, and this is found in the pressing demand for the rapid increase of the supply of preachers. With a course of seven years, only about half the number of young preachers can be put into the field within a given time, as with a course of four years; and at best the supply of preachers by our Bible schools is alarmingly insufficient. In looking over the statistics of the theological seminaries of the country, I find that there are 131 in all, with an aggregate of 4,734 students, or an average of about 36 students to the seminary. The Baptists, who control more of these institutions than any other denomination, have 18 with 858 students, or 53 students to the seminary. On the supposition that one-third of these students go out as preachers every year, these Baptist schools furnish only 286 preachers a year to supply the demands of that vast body of people, numbering at least two millions in the United States.

The attendance at our College of the Bible has been far above this average, having amounted to about 71 per annum during the sixteen years of its existence, inferior in number to very few of the

most famous theological seminaries of this country. But the number of our graduates is far smaller in proportion to the entire number than theirs. I presume that the entire number of young preachers, going out annually as graduates from our colleges, does not exceed thirty, although there is a constant demand for at least two hundred—that is, at least, two hundred could go out every year and find abundant employment and competent support. In view of this fact, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of stimulating our young brethren to consecrate themselves to this glorious work, or of supplying our colleges with abundant facilities for their education. The reason that we graduate so few in proportion to the number of matriculates, is because we have not the means of aiding poor young men when their own resources are exhausted.

There is no good thing against which plausible objections may not be urged, and none on this earth in which real defects may not be pointed out. Our institutions for the especial education of preachers are not exceptions to the rule. Many objections have been urged against them, and many defects in them have been pointed out. I propose now to deal briefly with some of these.

1. It is urged that they are proved unnecessary by the fact that many men have become eminent preachers without them. We answer, that they are proved necessary by the much greater number of men who have proved very inefficient preachers for the want of them; and that these few eminent preachers would have been still more eminent with them. Who can estimate the power and influence to which John Smith, Sam'l Rogers and Benj. Franklin would have attained had they enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education in early life? And who can tell how eminent for usefulness would have been hundreds of obscure and inefficient preachers among us had they been properly educated for their work?

2. It is said by some, that we should give a young man a liberal education, and then let him take up the study of the Bible for himself without a teacher. Well, this young man can of course accomplish more by his unaided efforts than if he had enjoyed no mental culture; but why should he have teachers at the beginning of all his previous studies, and none when he begins to study the Bible? The young Bachelor of Arts must have a teacher if he begins to study human law, or the art of healing the body, why not if he begin to study the divine law and the art of healing the soul?

3. It is often objected that students of such an institution are apt to echo the peculiar idea of their professors, and often to imitate them in style and manner. Doubtless this is to some extent true. A man who is incapable of impressing himself upon the young who are under his instruction is too weak to be a teacher of youth. If his peculiarities of style are grossly offensive, or if his peculiar ideas are decidedly pernicious, he should be displaced from the professor's chair; but if none of these things are true of him, young men will not be seriously injured by his influence. On the other hand, a very little observation teaches that every young man when he begins to preach, has already been impressed with somebody's peculiarities of thought and manner, most usually those of the most popular preacher in his neighborhood; and if his professor is not an improvement on this model he will at least be different, and will thus afford the young imitator another model to modify the influence of the first.

4. It has been objected to the College of the Bible, that it matriculates men with a very low grade of attainments, and that some who have gone out from it are very crude and rude specimens as preachers. We answer that the standard of admission into any of our colleges, and that the work of the institution is to be judged by its graduates, and not by its under-graduates—by those who have learned what it teaches, and not by those who have not. As well judge any other college by those who have taken but a part of its course, or an artist by pupils who have taken from him but a few lessons.

5. Again, it is urged that making preachers is the business of the churches, and not that of colleges. We answer, that none are more painfully aware of this than the professors in these colleges. Their work is simply to give young brethren that education by means of which the churches can make efficient preachers out of them by giving them work to do and sustaining them in it. But the chief trouble is that the churches are perpetually taking young men away from the colleges, and making preachers of them before they are fit for the work, and when the professors would gladly keep them longer at school. Many of the students, too, have already been made preachers by some church or churches before their professors ever see them, and these have generally discovered their great need of an education by trying in vain to do good work without it. The whole duty of the church in the premises is, to

encourage their pious and talented young men to desire the work, help them, if need be, to acquire an education for it, and then put them at it and sustain them.

6. Finally, it is objected, that educated young men seek all the prominent and desirable places in the ministry, and crowd aside older and more experienced preachers. In answer, we admit that there are some educated young preachers who are ambitious and self-seeking, but we insist that these unlovely qualities are not confined to the young, or to the educated, nor are they the result of education. Where they exist in an educated young man they are in spite of his education and not in consequence of it. But it is not always ambition or self-seeking which bring a finely educated and efficient young preacher into such a position. It is sometimes his superior fitness for the place, and his untiring industry in performing the duties of his calling. In such instances we should all be glad, even those of us who may be displaced, that the church has found a workman able and willing to do her work, and to do it well. In all other instances the evil will speedily work its own cure, even as a foaming wave when tossed too high will soon find its proper level.

In conclusion, I would remind all of my thoughtful readers, that the laborers are still distressingly few, the harvest is still alarmingly great, and our Master is constantly saying to us, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest."

J. W. MCGARVEY.

INGERSOLL IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

That Col. Ingersoll should appear in the *North American Review* as the opposer of the Bible, was a question for the Editor alone to determine. Whether he acted wisely and in good faith to the large majority of his readers, is another question, and one that we feel at liberty to discuss. If any man of brilliant attainments as an orator and a writer, were to become the champion of communism in its most ultra consequences, it is not supposable that so well-established a magazine would invite him to discuss his vagaries in its pages. It would be far from giving any assistance to the spread or propagation of any such revolutionary ideas. When our property rights and convictions of possession are concerned we become very conservative; but when our spiritual convictions are assailed, then, with some persons, full and free discussion is called for on the ground that truth has nothing to fear from error, and that it will emerge from the battle cloud all the brighter for the conflict. Why does not this apply as well to a material as to a spiritual truth? The existence of God and the divinity of Christ are as well established in the spiritual, as the *meum* is in the material; and why should any more privileges be given to discuss the one than the other? We do not object to the discussion because we are afraid that truth will suffer, or that our faith will be weakened, but we do object to the admission of blasphemy to respectability, and fear that the blighting and pernicious effects it will have upon minds not capable of discriminating between the true and the false. We would not object to the placing of an unsealed bottle of poison upon our study table within easy reach, but we would object most seriously to its being placed in our nursery. There is no telling the amount of evil that will grow out of that publication, and I would, were I in his place, pale in view of the responsibility incurred. These words are written to express my disapproval of thus dignifying infidelity, atheism and blasphemy; and also if perchance I may be able to restore to spiritual health any one who has been affected by this poison.

What he says is not new, he merely, with his rare gift of language, has re clothed old ideas, and with that *abandon* so fascinating to the thoughtless, rushes in to the denying of most holy and sacred truths. Men standing agape in wonder at his audacity, are reckoned as his converts. Men who from their evil lives much desire the abrogation of future punishment, applaud him to the echo. But the *cui bono?* remains ever present. What good is he able to accomplish by the inculcating of his disbelief? What man or woman for whom he expresses such solicitous concern, would be benefitted, and how, if he were to convince them that there was no God and that Jesus was not the Christ? He speaks and writes floridly about liberty of mind, but what advantage is gained by the casting off of the fetters of religious faith? Is he any happier, is he any better, is he a nobler man with his freedom from belief in the teachings of the Bible, than a Luther or a Garfield who were firm believers in inspiration? Is the logical tendency of his disbelief to make men and women happier? If it is, I cannot see it. If no good can come from it why encourage and aid him in his work?

To my mind, there has been a failure with those who have reviewed his lectures, to properly understand the nature of the discussion and what was legitimately required of them. They have, by his shrewdness, suffered themselves to take into their own hands the laboring oar, and have given him the easy task of directing their labor. He denounces the God of the Bible as upholding slavery, polygamy, war and religious persecution, and straightway his reviewers go to work to explain why God did it and thereby excuse him. Such a course, in my opinion, is altogether unreasonable and unfair. They surely forget that God's actions do not have to be, *cannot be*, explained by man. God is infinite, or he is not the God we worship; if he is infinite, can finite man explain his actions? No human mind has yet been able to bridge the space between the finite and the infinite, and it never can be done until "this mortal shall put on immortality," and then we can see Him as he is.

What logical deduction follows from his statement that God upheld slavery, polygamy, war and religious persecutions? First: That his statement is either true or false; and second: That if it is true, who is to judge whether it was right for Him to do it, God infinite in knowledge, or a man very finite in finite knowledge? It does not prove that the God of the Bible is no God, because the

Bible says he did something that we cannot understand. If we could understand all His purposes, plans and means of accomplishment, He would be no God but a man. "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord."

Because he says that the universe, according to his idea, is, always was, and forever will be, does not conclusively demonstrate the fact, and when the believers in God have said to the contrary for thousands of years, his denial does not throw the burden of proof upon them, and from him. It is an ancient belief, and he who denies it must prove it. The laws of discussion do not compel a man to prove a proposition that has been generally received, every time it may be disputed. Somethings are regarded as settled until they are unsettled, and a bare denial does not unsettle them. When he says, "that to put God back of the universe, compels us to admit that there was a time when nothing existed except God; that God had lived from eternity in an infinite vacuum, and in absolute idleness," does not do any such thing; but if it did would that prove that there was no God? He has succeeded admirably in forcing the work of proof upon his reviewers, while he appropriates the easy work of simply stating objections or assertions. It is his duty to prove that the "universe is, was and will forever be;" and that God, if He did create the universe lived in a perfect vacuum and complete idleness. He cannot escape this labor, except through the zeal of his reviewers; he must be held strictly to his legitimate work, before he can be admitted to the lists of controversy.

For the sake of public opinion, he sometimes makes a show of argument, but even this much but seldom. Here is a sample, not a fair one however, for it is his best. He takes the old syllogism of the school books of forty years ago: "Everything that exhibits marks of design had an intelligent creator; the world exhibits marks of design; therefore the world had an intelligent creator." His argument in full is this: "I know as little as any one else about the 'plan' of the universe; and as to the 'design,' I know just as little. It will not do to say that the universe was designed, and therefore there must be a designer. There must first be proof that it was designed. The idea that a design must have a beginning and that a designer need not, is a simple expression of human ignorance. We find a watch and we say: 'So curious and wonderful a thing must have had a maker.' We find the watch maker,

and we say: 'So curious and wonderful a thing as man must have had a maker.' We find God, and we then say: 'He is so wonderful that he must not have had a maker.' In other words, all things a little wonderful must have been created, but it is possible for a something to be so wonderful that it always existed. One would suppose that just as the wonder increased the necessity for a creator increased, because it is the wonder of the thing that suggests the idea of the thing."

This is Col. Ingersoll's logic when dealing with so vital a thing as man's spiritual faith.

I admit that the burden of proof is on the person who says that the universe exhibits marks of design, and it has been proved to the satisfaction of every candid mind thousands and thousands of times, and it is a standing proof itself. A man need only look, and lo! the proof is before him. Let him look at the composition of the soil and watch the effect of light, heat and moisture upon it, and see how by these influences its elements become adapted to plant life, and say if he sees no design in making the soil of such a composition so that these agencies would produce such a result. Let him compare the gills of a fish with the lungs of a man, and learn the habits of the two, and say if he can see no design in the gills for subaqueous life, and no design in the lungs for terrestrial existence. But why multiply proof? The second proposition, that whatever is designed had a designer, is axiomatic and needs no proof; the conclusion then inevitably follows. He tries, as you discover, to break the force of this by an illustration: The watch is found, marks of design are upon it, and the designer is sought for and found in man. How? By seeing him make another watch precisely like the one found. Man bears evidence of design in the structure of the hand and eye that make the watch, and his designer is sought. Is he found, and how? Do we find some other being who makes a man just like the man who made the watch? No. What do we find? A Book that tells us by whom, and how man was made. What do we do; do we rest satisfied with the statement given in the Book? No. We investigate the origin and credibility of the Book, and we find that by external and internal evidence it is what it purports to be, and then we are ready to believe what it says. It says that God, ever existing, made man. There our investigation stops, because the witness that testifies to the existence of God, the creator, testifies to God, the infinite.

Col. Ingersoll may claim that we should take the time and the space to record the external and internal evidences of the credibility of the Bible, but we deem it sufficient to refer him or any one desiring the information to either of the thousand books which contain this proof.

Suppose we let him find out the origin of man, because science, for which he professes so much regard, says the earth is much older than man. If the earth is older than man, then man must have come into existence since the world, and could not have existed from all eternity. There must have been a creation; now who was the creator? What will he do? Go to the protoplasm or to progressive development? Both absurdities have been exploded in an able paper in this number of the *REVIEW*. He can do nothing but settle back on a calm, cold, bare, bleak and dreary negation.

The argument of design and designer is sufficient to place any reasonable man, in the absence of contradiction, upon the foundation of belief in the existence of the God of the Bible, and there we must stand firmly until the atheists force us from it with arguments large and forcible. It is folly for us to get off this foundation every time we are asked and then climb up again simply to humor their whims. We stay there until we are pushed off. They must do the work.

Resting upon this foundation, we can calmly and slow-pulsed, listen to his puerile criticisms of God's wondrous works and ways, only feeling pity for any creature so presumptuous.

Having taken the position that the universe is eternal and self-existent, that there is nothing beyond it, and that there are no laws regulating its phenomena, but that what we call natural laws are only classified phenomena, he holds the God of the Bible responsible for all that is objectionable to him. He says if there is a God behind the universe, of course he is responsible for its material and moral government; and holding him thus responsible, he discards him because the phenomena are unjust. Suppose that Col. Ingersoll is right, that there is nothing back of the universe, what is he going to do about it? The phenomena are stubborn facts; they remain; no amount of logic or rhetoric will remove them. They are just as repugnant to justice and mercy, from his standpoint, as ever they were. He discarded God on account of these phenomena; will he discard the universe? Slavery has always existed, and

always will, in some form; pestilences have come in all ages, and will continue to come; wars have been waged from the time there were people enough to carry them on, and they will continue; lusts have been gratified as long as opportunity was afforded; and men have been rebellious against authority, human and divine, ever since his creation, and will continue so even to the end. What does all this prove? Not what he says, that these things should not be permitted, but that we are too feeble in intellect to comprehend them. He says that belief in God demands a fettered intellect, and that our minds are dwarfed by its exercise. Standing at the door of nature's vast laboratory we see phenomena innumerable that we cannot understand. We see them—we believe them, and in the believing are we dwarfing our intellects?

Having eliminated God from his faith, by a criticism of his actions, he next attempts to do the same thing for his son. If he had accomplished the first, the latter was a work of supererogation. It was simply undertaken as a labor of love, to gratify his taste for pulling down things held sacred. If there was no Father there could be no Son; and the only claim that Jesus ever made was that he was the Son of God. "I and my Father are one."

Col. Ingersoll attempts to show from internal evidences that the New Testament Scriptures are not to be believed. He objects to the witnesses. He says, that if they were all inspired for the same purpose, they would have all told the same story in precisely the same words and there would have been no necessity for but one testimony. He here shows indications that he does not understand what inspiration means. He admits that if they had made no claim to inspiration more credibility would attach to their testimony on account of the slight variation in narrative and facts, as two witnesses giving their testimony in identical words would be regarded as giving in a made-up story. He denies their inspiration—suppose they were mistaken about that—then how can he refuse to believe them? He says if they were not inspired, their testimonies taken together would be entitled to consideration; he says they were not inspired, then why not believe them? The fact of being inspired was not something that could appeal bodily to their senses, and they testified to what they saw and heard. They could have been mistaken about the one when their evidence would be good about the other. I could say that I dreamed that a house was on fire, that I awoke and went to the house, that it was on fire, and that the fur-

niture was saved. Col. Ingersoll could say that he dreamed that the same house was on fire, that he awoke and went to the house, that it was on fire and that some of the furniture was saved and all the family. A third person testifies that it was generally reported that the same house was burned up and the furniture and family were saved. The public might doubt about our dreaming, but it would nevertheless receive our testimony about the fire; and although we differed in our statements no one would say that we had contradicted each other.

Now make the application: One of the New Testament writers says he was inspired; that he was an eye-witness to the sayings and doings of Jesus; that Jesus healed the centurion's servant (Matt. 8:5-13); that he arose from the grave, as proved by the two Marys (Matt. 28:9-10,) and that he was the Christ. Another one of these writers says he was inspired; that he was an eye-witness to the sayings and doings of Jesus; but he says nothing about the centurion's servant, but tells of a miracle that Jesus did, the healing of a blind man (Mark 8:22-23) that the first witness does not mention; that he arose from the dead, as proved by the two men going to Emmaus (Mark 16:12), which event the first did not mention; and that he was the Christ. Another, who did not claim to have been an eye-witness to all that Jesus said and did, testifies that the general report and belief was that Jesus healed the centurion's servant; and that he did after his resurrection appear to the two men on their way to Emmaus. Now Col. Ingersoll may doubt about the inspiration of the first two witnesses, but can he doubt their testimony as to facts, when the facts stated by each, though not by both, are substantiated by general report, when those facts are both in harmony with the object sought to be proved by them. A man to refuse a verdict in favor of the claimant to divinity when he has produced such testimony, has to fetter his reason and harden his heart against justice.

He objects to their claim to inspiration, because: "Unless it contains grander and more wonderful things than man has written, we are not only justified in saying, but we are compelled to say, that it was written by no being superior to man." Does he not understand that whatever is written for man, must be within range of man's intellect, and that if inspiration had led them to unfold truths beyond what they did, that men could not have comprehended them?

"If he fully apprehended the subject he would understand that these men were inspired to do just what they did do, which was to give testimony that would conform to the rules of evidence required by the most enlightened jurisprudence. The Gospels were written that men might believe, and each one was inspired to write what was best calculated to produce this result in the minds of different persons requiring different proofs.

He makes a further objection to Christ's claim to divinity, but this time the objection is to his failure to do his work perfectly. He claims that if Christ was divine that he knew what would be in the future and that he should have so spoken as to have prevented the happening of certain things. This is a singular objection in two ways: That Col. Ingersoll should dictate to Christ what he should have done; and that everything that he says Christ ought to have done, but did not do, the New Testament says Christ did do. He claims that Christ failed to speak against persecution on account of difference of opinion. Christ said: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." (Matthew, 7:12.) Is not this as explicit as words can make it, that men should not persecute for opinion's sake?

"Why did he not plainly say I am the Son of God?" When one man says another man is his father, it is just as positive as to the relationship as if he had said, I am that man's son. Jesus did this repeatedly. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (Matt. 11:27.) "Why did he not explain the doctrine of the trinity?" That is a question that Col. Ingersoll will have to answer himself. I can find no mention of the "trinity" in the New Testament, and no "doctrine" about it by any apostle or evangelist. What harm has resulted from his silence on the subject? All the divisions that have arisen have been on account of men's speculations. If they had been content to remain silent where Christ was silent, we would have had no discord on the subject.

"Why did he not tell the manner of baptism that was pleasing to him?" By asking this question he admits that he is not read up on the subject. I suppose that it would be impossible for him to find a single Greek scholar but who would say that the language of

Christ was as definite as language could be. We must tell Col. Ingersoll that the difference about the ordinance of baptism is not in not knowing what Christ said, but in our unwillingness to do what he commanded.

"Why did he not say something positive, definite and satisfactory about another world?" Christians have always thought that he did, but it seems that Col. Ingersoll was not aware of it. Permit me to commend the following scripture to his consideration:

"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. But as it is written, eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. And God shall wipe all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

He has objected to Jesus because He neglected to do some things and now he objects to him because he did certain things. He says: "It was the teacher of universal benevolence who rent the veil between time and eternity, and fixed the horrified gaze of man on the lurid gulfs of hell." He means, I suppose, that Jesus attempted and pretended to do this, for he denies that Jesus had any more than human power, and no human being had the power to rend the veil, and no one could show the "lurid gulfs of hell," according to him, because there are none to show. Thus his objection narrows itself down to this, that because Jesus taught that there was a life beyond the grave, and that that life for the sinner was eternal pain, he could not be divine. Atheists and infidels have a great deal of trouble with logic. According to them there is no God or Christ, which means that there is no being superior to themselves, because the beings who claim to be God and Christ differ from us in actions.

A being to be a God must be immeasurably superior to man, and yet man must set in judgment upon his claims and judge him by his actions, which must be measured by a standard that is immeasurably below him! Jesus to be Christ must teach doctrines and state facts beyond the power of man, and then man must sit in judgment upon those facts and decide whether they are right or not! This is an unfettered mind, of which he boasts so much, gone mad. He requires of Jesus, if he be the Christ, that he shall rend the veil between time and eternity, and when he does it, and

shows Col. Ingersoll what he does not wish to see, then he says he is not the Christ, because the Christ would not have disclosed a sight displeasing to man, although the requisite of the Christ was that he must teach something above man's power to invent! Such is the logic of infidelity.

It is not for me to defend the justness of eternal punishment, it is only for me to know that Jesus is the Christ, and that he so decreed. When I believe that, I have no opinion about the other, —I know it is right.

Col. Ingersoll is liberal enough to say: "Take from the New Testament all passages upholding the idea that belief is necessary to salvation; that Christ was offered as an atonement for the sins of the world; that the punishment of the human soul will go on forever; that heaven is the reward of faith, and hell the penalty of honest investigation; take from it all miraculous stories, and I admit all the good passages are true." He writes as if he thought the Christian Religion was greatly honored by even this modicum of approval from him, but he is vastly mistaken. In his second article he says: "I do not understand that the Christians of to-day insist that simple belief will secure the salvation of the soul. But Christians do insist that without belief no man can be saved." If I understand Col. Ingersoll, when he denies that there is anything back of the universe, he denies a future state either of happiness or misery. Rejecting the idea of "salvation" altogether, why does he object to it on the ground of "belief," when he says: "My doctrine is that there is only one way to be saved, and that is to act in harmony with your surroundings." I cannot understand this. When he says there is nothing behind the universe, and that Jesus was more cruel than God, who was more cruel than all men, because Jesus carried punishment beyond this life, what is it that he will be saved from by acting in harmony with his surroundings? The idea of "salvation" could not exist without the idea of "condemnation" preceding it; therefore, according to his own doctrine, "that there is only one way to be saved," implies that a failure to act in that way will lead to condemnation. What does he mean by "acting in harmony with your surroundings"? Does he mean that a man whose life has been cast among the vile, must act in harmony with his surroundings, and the man who is associated with the virtuous, must act virtuously, and that the two, though living opposite lives, will both be saved, because they acted in har-

mony with their surroundings? It seems to me that any man with "mind unfettered" would have more trouble in believing this than some things to which he objects so earnestly. He admits that the Christians of to-day do not teach that simple belief, (faith without works), will secure salvation; but that Christians now demand, in addition to belief in Christ, that men shall do righteously. If Christ made good works a condition of salvation, and Col. Ingersoll makes the same requirement, why does he object so much to faith in Christ? As we have shown, he admits that Christ rent the veil between time and eternity, that before him there was no salvation, and if good works will secure this salvation, how can we refuse belief in the person who originated the salvation which good works will secure? Sound logic requires, from his own premises, that "belief in Christ is necessary to salvation" shall not be taken from the New Testament.

He also insists, "that Christ was offered as an atonement for the sins of the world," must be stricken from the New Testament before he can endorse it. Christians think that if you eliminate the idea of atonement from the death of Christ, you have taken away its very essence. We think that if his death was not for our good that it was unnecessary. He seems to have a very erroneous idea of atonement. He says that God would be unjust to permit an innocent man to suffer in the place of the guilty; that it would be wrong, both in the abstract, and in practice, to pardon a murderer and turn him loose, if he could find some innocent man who would be hanged in his place. Now this is not the atonement. The word is found only once in the New Testament; the Greek word which is so translated is in the noun form found only four times and in the verb form five times, and with this single exception, is rendered by *reconcile* and *reconciliation*. But in 1 Peter 3:18, we have, "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." This much scripture does he seemingly have for his idea of the atonement. But what is the teaching of the New Testament in reference to the death of Christ? Sin is not a debt, it cannot be paid, either by the person himself or some one for him. Sin is a crime, a wrong-doing, a violation of law. A criminal can only be punished or forgiven. If forgiven, it is a simple act of mercy, not of justice. God, the great law-giver, says if you are sincerely sorry for sins committed, so sorry that you

really intend to try to keep from sinning in the future, for that is what repentance means, and will show me by your works that you are thus repentant, I will forgive you; not that your works of repentance have paid or canceled the sin; but if you are sorry I will be merciful. Now what evidence does God require of this repentance? He says my Son, acting as if all mankind were penitent, manifested this universal repentance by dying. Such a manifestation of sorrow led God to exercise his mercy, and he promised that to every person who would acknowledge his Son, and thereby become partaker of his death, he would be merciful and pardon his sins. With this understanding of the atonement, or the reconciling of man to God, not the reconciling of God to man, all of his difficulties about the rescue of Jesus from the Jews vanish. He thought that if some bold disciple had rescued Jesus, that there would have been no way of salvation, that the man himself would have been eternally damned as well as the whole world. He forgets that it was just as impossible for him to be rescued, as it was for the Jews to put him to death without his consent. If by force, and not by his consent, he had been put to death, he would not have been divine, nor would his death have been an act of typical repentance.

"That the punishment of the human soul will go on forever." This is another doctrine that he demands shall be stricken out of the New Testament before he will accept it. Why should he object to this? He says because it is cruel, unjust and unreasonable. That it is cruel by its severity; that it is unjust because of man's nature and surroundings, over which he has no control; and unreasonable because it is out of proportion to the offence. It is a sufficient answer to all these objections to say that if God so ordered it, it is right, simply because he did so order; there we could rest the case with perfect propriety until he had produced some show of argument to the contrary. The mere statement of his objections does not throw the burden of proof upon us. But to satisfy some minds that may be troubled by his statements, suppose we say: That to reward a man for good deeds done in this life, for all eternity, would be out of proportion. Future happiness and future misery must be equal in duration and intensity to be the rewards of good and evil lives. Gregory the Great said: "It belongs to the Divine justice that they should never be without punishment who in this life wished never to be without sin."

"That heaven is the reward of faith, and hell the penalty of honest investigation." We have shown that Col. Ingersoll admits that Christians do not claim that faith without works will save a man, and by the motto of this Magazine, it is seen that honest investigation is commanded by the New Testament. "Prove all things, hold fast to that which is true ;" but this does not give license to a poor, weak, finite man to criticize the infinite God. "Christians excuse themselves for belonging to the church, by denying a part of the creed." This is not true, and the error is in substituting *the* for *a* before church, and *the* for *its* before creed ; but when read "Christians excuse themselves for belonging to *a* church, by denying *its* creed," is to a certain extent true, but the part they deny is not found in the Bible, it is of human origin, and hence they deny it.

"The pulpit is losing because the people are growing." This is simply not the fact. More people are turning to Christ, more money is being given for religious purposes, and more missionary enterprises are carried on now than ever before.

"The sciences are regarded as infidels, and facts as scoffers." This is not true. Some scientists have misinterpreted nature and revelation, either both, or one or the other, and they have proclaimed a discrepancy. But as light breaks in on science and our knowledge grows about sacred things, the harmony becomes more complete.

Col. Ingersoll endeavors to discredit the New Testament by dwelling upon the want of harmony of the four historians. The argument is old, I do not know that he claims for it originality, but the being old does not, if it is true, weaken its force. We only speak of it as being old, to assure the friends of Christ that no new danger menaces their faith, and to admonish the infidel fledgelings that it will not demolish Christianity, for it has been pelted with it for several centuries without losing ground.

E. W. HERNDON.

THE EDUCATED MAN.

"All the world cries, where is the man who will save us? We want a man! Don't look so far for this man: you have him at hand. This man—it is you, it is I, it is each one of us! How to constitute one's self a man? Nothing harder, if one knows not how to *will* it; nothing easier if one *wills* it.—*Alexander Dumas.*"

The philosopher, who proclaimed, "*know thyself*," announced in terse language the highest duty of man. To accomplish this, is indeed, the great life-task. It begins with simplest objectivity and ends with the highest and most complex subjectivity. All rational beings must, and they should become more or less acquainted with the objective. Their knowledge of it may be empirical, yet some acquaintance with the external world is indispensable, for how shall an intelligent being correlate himself to what he does not know?

To the subjective, many do approach; not so many apprehend, and fewer still fully appreciate or comprehend. Such is the testimony of observation and experience—it is the history of civilization. The abstract is reached by ascending the stepping-stones of the concrete. This is why a language must first exist before grammar can be made, which is to say no more than that some acquaintance with objects susceptible of being classified must be had before any classification of those objects can be made, just as the substance must exist in order that there may be a shadow—the object before an image of it can be formed.

Now since an idea is an image in the mind, there should first be a corresponding entity to be imaged. If this is true, it follows there can be no idea except upon the predication of something, real or imaginary, respecting which it is concerned. It follows, also, that to multiply the objects of perception and conception is to multiply the possibility of ideas, and as these perceptions and conceptions are appropriated by any one, the ideas and reflections consequent, are in a peculiar sense his own and make him what he is, for in proportion that ideas are impressed and appropriated they become a part of character; they are acted upon; they control daily life, and they shape destiny.

Objects, whether real or imaginary, are not all similar, so ideas concerning them can be no less variant. If this were not so, there could be but one idea or many very similar ideas. Then the multiplication of objects could only serve to intensify one idea, in which event, there could be no such thing as relation, comparison or judgment. But since the number of objects in the universe is infinite, and since each object may sustain an infinite number of relations, the number of ideas growing out of them may be infinite and multifiform. The mind of man being in a sense finite it is clear, that no one person, nor indeed all persons taken together may be declared to be the possessor of this infinite number of ideas. This fact becomes somewhat comprehensible from a simple illustration. The word *Plattsburg* is composed of ten letters. According to the law of permutations, these ten letters may be written in 3,628,800 different combinations. Now if such a number is required to express the relations which these ten objects may assume, who shall read us the number expressing the combinations of all objects!

It may be assumed that one person, during his natural life, can become acquainted with but few of these infinite relations. His harvest of these will constitute his stock of knowledge. But not only are objects—subjects of thought—not similar, but many of them possess opposing and contradictory qualities; and when ideas growing out of these opposing and contradictory relations are brought together the result must be a conflict or discord; and in the proportion as such conflicting or discordant ideas are impressed or appropriated by any one, his life will be made contradictory and ineffectual.

A life may be effectual or ineffectual; it may be partly right and partly wrong; or, it may be wholly right or wholly wrong. When I say a life may be effectual, I mean that it may be controlled by such ideas gathered, impressed and appropriated, that it is thereby directed for the accomplishment of the highest purposes and aspirations of which that life is capable. By ineffectual, I mean that the acquired forces of life tend to thwart or defeat the attainment of the highest purposes and aspirations of which life is capable. Again, in the ratio that these qualities are approximately counterbalanced, life may be partly right and partly wrong. Where the whole life is normal and where it harvests only those controlling principles which eventuate in the greatest success, it is wholly right, while the life directly opposed to this is wholly wrong. As

in natural reproduction, like begets like, it is no less true, that right ideas produce a right life, and wrong ideas produce a wrong life. From these reflections I deduce a distinction between right and wrong—between the true and the false; that which conduces to make life successful, in the true sense, is right and true, while that which does not conduce to make life successful, or that which prevents life from being so, is wrong and false.

It would be as difficult to determine whether there is more right or more wrong, in the abstract, as it would be to determine whether there is more heat or cold. In fact, in both cases, the presence of the one implies the absence of the other. The common idea that there is more wrong than right is erroneous. The idea is based on witnessed manifestations rather than on what really exists. Even in witnessed manifestations it is not always easy to distinguish the right from the wrong. From clearly marked distinction in their extremes, they shade down and almost, imperceptibly, interchange at the equator of their hemispheres. Hence, such relations, in farthest extremes, are readily distinguishable one from the other, while, in nearest means they appear, to the uneducated eye, one and the same.

From these premises, it will be seen that too much care cannot be exercised in the appropriation of proper ideas—ideas which are right and true. A choice can and must be made by every one. No one can take all, and if he could, the question at once arises, would it be advisable? Certainly it would not be advisable to appropriate wrong and false ideas, for these defeat the very object for which he should strive to obtain any at all. He should seek to know the right and true, and I mean by *know*, to make it a part of one's being, for such knowledge only can lift one into a higher sphere of life and accomplish the highest fulfillment of destiny.

But here we are confronted with the fact, that many things, apparently belonging to the true and right are utterly beyond one's reach. That is, there is so much belonging to the right and true that not only is no life long enough to gather all; but if it were, as I have said, it would not be advisable one should. Thus, by dint of perseverance, one might learn the age of every person in a county, and he might, possibly, be able to give the dates of birth; but this knowledge while it is not harmful, would ill repay the toil necessary to acquire it. It might, indeed, once or twice in the life time of this walking chronological phenomenon, be called into requisi-

tion. Yet after all who would not recall, *Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*

What has been said suggests another classification of ideas: valuable and not valuable. These two classes I shall briefly define as follows. An idea is valuable, if it pays, it is not valuable if it does not pay. The word pay, I am well aware, is usually understood to apply to dollars and cents; but I am using it in a higher signification. Our energies and utmost endeavors cannot be too zealously exerted to acquire ideas which will pay—ideas which, when acquired, advance us higher and higher in the enjoyment of the rational, the useful and the good.

Life is too short for us to stand idle by the glass on the stand, and, listless, watch the priceless, golden grains which surely and rapidly are falling through.

" Could a man be secure
That his days would endure
As of old, for a thousand years,
What things might he know!
What deeds might he do!
And all without hurry or care,"

But as man cannot be made thus secure, while the grains are falling, he must be up and doing.

The adage "Ignorance is bliss," has run around the world. It is an injurious fallacy which many have esteemed wisdom. A pig may lie in a mud-puddle and grunt in contentment at all the busy world. He is wholly ignorant whether peace exists between Russia and Turkey, nor does he care. He is utterly indifferent as to the question his owner is discussing whether to sell him in the market or keep him for lard and sausage. I would not deprive any one of the consolation he seeks in that adage, but his doing so reminds me of another which rivals it in popularity: "Birds of a feather flock together."

"Knowledge is power" and so is ignorance. Essays and volumes are written to show how knowledge is powerful; but how few trouble themselves to prove that ignorance is power? Yet who does not know that ignorance has wider sway in the world than knowledge has? Who does not know that ignorance is a great source of shame, bloodshed and crime? The wise have been engaged for centuries in trying to extirpate the dydra-enemy. Ignorance keeps up large jails and penitentiaries; it destroys the hap-

pininess of families and curses the state; it leads to murder and affords occasion for the scaffold to disgrace our present civilization; it shuts out the sunshine of beauty and casts a blighting shadow over the purest and best.

"How forcible are right words!" exclaimed Job. Yes! But with equal justice he might have said, How forcible are wrong words! The wrong words have more power with ignorant minds than the right words. They fit themselves into wrong heads, and prejudiced heads, and empty heads, and have power over them. The right words have often no meaning for them, any more than if they were the words of some dead language. The wise man's thoughts do not reach the multitude, but fly over their heads. Only the few as yet apprehend them."—[Smiles on Thrift, pp. 72-3.]

I do not mean to say that all crime originates in ignorance; but it is true that a different source is rather an exception according to statistical showing. Do you ask how this can be otherwise? I answer, by a diffusion of knowledge. Ignorance now dominant should be overcome and this is the way to do it. "Ignorance," says Smiles, "is powerful, because knowledge, as yet, has obtained access only to the minds of the few. Let knowledge become more generally diffused; let the multitude become educated, thoughtful, and wise; and then knowledge may obtain the ascendancy over ignorance. But that time has not yet arrived."

That man is a true philanthropist—is a benefactor to his race, who does all he can for the education of the rising generation, in which he lives. That man who bestows his energies, his brain and muscle to the erection of an academy of learning, or even of an humble school house, does a greater work than all the labors of Hercules. That man who spends his money and property to bring wide and ample opportunities of knowledge to his children and his neighbor's children does a greater good and confers a more substantial blessing than to leave them the riches of the Lydian king. That man, who from noble impulse contributes assistance to his community to educate its youth, deserves more at the hands of posterity than he, who makes the conquests of Alexander.

Is it further inquired why this is so? It is enough here to say, such a person throws his influence on the side of knowledge, on the side of light, on the side of the beautiful, the good, the right and the true. He is beginning at the right place and in the right way to benefit his own, to bless the state, and to regenerate the

world. He is assisting to lay deep and firm the foundation, upon which the most prosperous government may rest. He is aiding and supporting free institutions. He is advocating free thought and individual independence, and doing all in such a manner that the argument of his advocacy must be felt. He is casting his bread upon the waters which is most sure to return to him bearing him honor and delight. He is acting as an educated man. He is living in an exalted sense not only for time, but for eternity. He is promoting the great cause of truth in thus declaring that men should educate.

Knowledge has blessed the individual, the state, the world, in proportion to its diffusion. Everywhere this truth finds illustration. Why is property more valuable in some communities than it is in others? Why do some states lead others? What gives a nation power and prestige among nations? Spread the map of the world before you and trace the lines of enlightenment. Do you not observe as you pass along, that you touch only those nations that stand out like stars of the first magnitude among the hosts of the skies. As you proceed from enlightenment to civilization, and from civilization to barbarism you pass from a general diffusion of knowledge towards the darkness of ignorance, and the shadows gather about deeper and blacker the further you proceed.

Nations are blessed by a diffusion of knowledge because the several members composing it are thereby elevated. Education gives to every person possessing it additional opportunities to make money and for exalting his own sphere of being. I do not wish to be understood, that the acquirement of money is the motive that should lead us to educate. Such a motive could but spring from impulses born of ignorance; and it were too much to say that ignorance shall induce us to become educated! This would build a house divided against itself. "We must believe that in course of time, as man's nature becomes improved by education—secular, moral and religious—they may be induced to make a better use of their means by considerations of prudence, forethought and parental responsibility. A German writer speaks of the education given to a child as a *capital*—equivalent to a store of money—placed at its disposal by the parent. The child, when grown to manhood, may employ the education, as he might employ the money, badly; but that is no argument against the possession of either. Of course, the value of education, as of money, chiefly consists in its proper use.

And one of the advantages of knowledge is, that the very acquisition of it tends to increase the capability of using it aright; which is certainly not the case with the accumulation of money. Education however obtained is always an advantage to a man. Even as a means of material advancement, it is worthy of being sought after, not to speak of its moral uses as an elevator of character, and intelligence."

If the race between nations has been in the past a competition in the field or on the sea; in the use of the spear, the lance and in the forming of the phalanx, the day will come, when this competition will be one of intellect. It will then be not whose muscle is firmest or who has most of the tiger; but who in elevated intelligence stands highest and who is nearest to God.

In its relation to money, education does more than to direct in channels most certain of its acquirement, but what is of much greater importance, it teaches how to spend it. The reports of Mr. Tremenhare to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, speaking of the condition of the population in the iron and coal districts, shows the effect of education in this regard. It appears from his report, that crime and immorality increased as wages were increased. This is accounted for on the ground that the low tastes and depraved desires of the people in these districts found larger gratification as the means were supplied; but in localities where education had made some progress there was a corresponding increase in the savings, skill, industry, and comfort of the people. The most effectual means to solve the tramp problem and to ameliorate the condition of the laboring class of the country, is to educate. This principle gave birth to the public school system both in this country and in Europe. Any community, state or nation that is not alive to the importance of educating the rising generation, must go to the rear and seek consolation in the shadows of by-gone ages. But the wise are in the van of life. What prove annoyances to the ignorant and superstitious disturb not the wise. He lives above the storm-cloud, and the sunshine never fades from his horizon. By adversity he is not cast down. He yields not to failures nor to discouragements.

"All places that the eye of Heaven visits,
Are to the wise man ports and happy homes."

But how are men to become wise? Educate them. If an educated man is a wise man, who is an educated man? How shall

he be known? I answer, an educated man is one who knows how to live successfully. One who knows how to live successfully, has acquired, impressed and appropriated those ideas which belong to the right and the true; those ideas which pay; those which are valuable; those which conduce to the acquirement of the highest purposes and aspirations of which his nature is capable. He does not believe that ignorance is bliss; he knows that it is power, but that it may be overcome. He is free in thought and lives above the conflux of petty cares that harass the superstitious and simple. He is a patron of science and learning and he enriches the State in which he lives by his being a member of it. He is a blessing to the world, because his life is an influence directing to the pure, the beautiful and the good. He is an essential factor in the product of the world's happiness.

"In the essential vesture of creation,
He doth bear all excellency."

But man is not born an educated being. "When we take a survey of nature, we view man, in his infancy, more helpless and indigent than the brutal creation; he lies languishing for days, months and years, totally incapable of providing sustenance for himself, of guarding against the attack of the wild beasts of the field, or sheltering himself from the inclemencies of the weather. It might have pleased the great Creator of heaven and earth, to have made man independent of all other beings; but, as dependence is one of the strongest bonds of society, mankind were made dependent on each other for protection and security," &c. So reads a paragraph from a widely known monitorial formula. It is beautifully expressive of man's early helplessness. As to why he is so, it is enough, perhaps, to recognize the fact. For aught I know, it may be that by the gradual development and ascension of man's powers he is led to ask, What more? or, "If a man die shall he live again?"

At birth the powers are dormant and the capabilities are undeveloped. The word *educate* expresses what must be done for these powers and capabilities—they must be drawn out. This suggests another answer to our question, who is an educated man? I answer again, it is he, whose powers and capabilities are drawn out or developed.

From this definition it will be seen that a person is best educated by applying means which best develop his powers and capa-

bilities. Now if it should be objected that this definition is not consistent with the other, since a person's powers and capabilities may be developed for evil instead of for good, and that such an educated man would be a curse rather than a blessing to society. To this I reply that man is possessed of a triune nature. He is a perfect organism; but the trinity of his being consists of his physical, intellectual and moral natures. When I speak of an educated man, I do not mean the development of one or two of his natures, to the neglect or subversion of one or two; but the harmonious development of all three. Let this be done, and that his life then shall become an influence for evil, becomes an impossibility. The development of the physical nature, the intellectual and moral being ignored, may exhibit to the world a brutal prize-fighter, but never an educated man. The physical and intellectual natures may be studiously developed, without any regard to the moral, and the result may be an expert bank-defaulter, an embezzler, a hardened criminal or a conscienceless villain, difficult to be detected and almost impossible to be brought to justice; but never can such development exhibit one I have defined to be an educated man.

That teacher, who, by constant endeavor and unceasing watchfulness, impresses upon his pupils the highest conceptions of honor, love for the true and moral uprightness, observing that the physical and intellectual powers are kept at equal pace, may hope to realize the noblest conception that ever entered into the mind of man. The product of such an education stands at the head of creation and is the grandest work of God. What a contrast exists between such and the distorted wreck, wretched and miserable failure we too often see! What a difference there must be in the most common cogitations of these two men! The thoughts of the educated man flow through free channels of the mind like crystal waters through golden viaducts; those of ignorance tumble confusedly through rocky and clayey fields. The one is pure and reflect only images of good; the other is murky and partake of the uncertain nature from which they are evolved. The one catches the gold of the skies by day and the silver of the stars by night; the other assimilates with the storm and partakes of obscurity. In a word the educated is prepared to live successfully; the uneducated is not so prepared, and if success crowns his efforts it is empirical rather than rational. The educated man does not impute his mistakes to bad luck; the ignorant are too apt to impute their faults and even

misfortunes to unfavorable luck. George Gibson, of Cincinnati, Ohio, was an owner of several steamers, that plied on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. He was a man of large experience and of great practical ability. One morning one of his pilots stepped into his office and with some hesitation said, "Well, Mr. Gibson, I am very sorry to tell you of my bad, bad luck. Just below Memphis the "Duchess" ran on a snag and sank in fifteen feet water. I have had very bad luck."

"You are sorry you had such bad luck!" replied Mr. Gibson. "Don't say your bad luck, sir; it was your bad management."

The language of the pilot is the language of ignorance; the language of the owner, the language of wisdom and of science.

The educated man studies the law of cause and effect and so forecasts the future by knowing what similar causes have heretofore effected. The ignorant too often await the effect, and then gape in wonder at the cause.

Through what curriculum has the educated man passed, or through what curriculum must one pass to become educated? The answer to this question will give us another definition of an educated man. In general, that curriculum which fits a man to live successfully in its highest significance, is such a one as is required to make an educated man.

1. The laws of health cannot be neglected. These, though among the last in common educational courses, should be the very first to receive attention. The mere statement of this fact should carry conviction of its truth. To speak paradoxically, ignorance of physiology and hygiene, every year wastes millions of years. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the life of man is cut short one-third by transgression of laws that can and should be known.

It is a great error to suppose that any one entirely recovers from any disease or malady. One never becomes fully restored. In the language of Mr. Herbert Spencer, "In all cases a permanent damage is done; and along with the other such items which nature in her strict account-keeping never drops, will tell against us to the inevitable shortening of our days." According to this great thinker, life is shortened one-half by ignorance, which is an estimate higher than I have made. Thus is it manifest, some acquaintance with the laws of physical upbuilding should be made as early as possible. This is so because self-preservation is instinctive. The infant that screams in alarm at sudden and unexpected noises, or

buries its face in its mother's bosom to avoid seeing some strange spectacle: its shrinking, its alarm, its screams are innate manifestations of a great primal law. As the child advances in years it becomes familiar with its every-day surroundings, and as it becomes well acquainted with these, it ceases to fear them, and whatever injury they may inflict, it learns to avoid. 2. Next to the laws governing self-preservation are those of parent-hood; and, 3, sociology; and 4, the laws of mind; and, 5, morals and psychology.

Each of these classes has besides its objective relations, a subjective importance. For example, self-preservation must be directed to the protection of the physical organism from injury, but it would be a view too narrow thus to circumscribe it. It must be directed to the discrimination between the true and false; between right and wrong ideas. This capability is born with every rational being. Foolish man to give over all effort too soon, or not to begin the development of thy wondrous capabilities, for,

"Doubtless, unto thee is given
A life that bears immortal fruit
In such great offices as suit
The full grown energies of heaven."—TENNYSON.

But Heaven does not so interfere with the development of energies that they may not be wrested from the normal line to utter degradation.

The normal and instinctive impulses of nature are always in the right direction, but they are so often thwarted, overpowered and so blunted that at last they sometimes appear not to admonish. This sad truth finds confirmation in the perverted tastes, habits and lives of men; in wastefulness, thriftlessness and wretchedness; in the amount of evil, ignorance and early death. Surely, if these consequences can be avoided, the motive to do so should be fostered and cherished, and, in the life of every one, it should be a governing motive.

When should one enter on this curriculum I here present? As soon as possible. A philosopher has said impressions are received by the child in the cradle that influence all its subsequent life. As self-preservation begins at the earliest dawn of infancy, so the unconscious mind, too, begins to awaken and to receive lasting impressions. So early, does "The Soul, immortal as its Sire," begin its race of light—alas, that it ever should end its race in unutterable night!

Ignorance can never develop the wonderful organism of man harmoniously. It requires education to educate—powers which are developed to direct aright the development of heaven-born energies in others. The idea that knowledge, consistent with a high type of manhood may be imparted with a birch, ferule, or with a club, is rapidly becoming obsolete. Schools are striving to interpret nature. Tyranny and vassalage belong to the Middle Ages and not to enlightenment. Attention is now directed to the importance of beginning at the beginning.

The development of the three-fold nature of the child in harmony with its natural impulses, is now agitated in Germany, England, France and the United States. Germany, perhaps, takes the lead. This harmonious development is begun before the child is old enough to take up letters. Educators are already bearing testimony to rich fruit gathered in. Undue precocity is gently restrained and latent powers are brought into exercise. By such a course at the age of six and eight a sound, evenly balanced mind is bourne by a healthy and strong body. Such children are best prepared to enter upon general or special studies as they may be presented. Such do not readily tire and fail; they push forward in the great competition and conquer. They are proper material of which educated men and women may be made, yet in unfortunate hands the highest expectations may never be realized—under favorable circumstances they cannot disappoint. Men thus educated are prepared to be parents, which is certainly one of the highest considerations to which thoughtful men can address themselves, though it is too often the one last thought of. It is indeed, of chief and sublime importance. No photographic plate was ever made as sensitive to catch the silent pencillings of the sunshine, as is this eternal organism to receive the impressions of ignorance or the wisdom of God. Yet the multitude treat it as if impressions of wrong, of the false, and of evil were as easily erased as chalk-marks from a black-board. In what eternal colors will the future emblazon such a delusion? but the exposition will come, when it will be too late to remedy the evil.

The child must be taught to think. It should early be made conscious of its own powers. It should early rejoice in mental liberty. An instructor cannot always be near to say this is right or that is wrong; this is true or that is false. Ideas are to be gathered, arranged, classified and utilized. The child must early begin to

discriminate for itself. Repetition of formularies will never make an educated man. That instructor is a tyrant who represses freedom of thought. If he cannot endure correction it is his ignorance that disallows it. Such a one does the community a greater and more lasting injury, than that conscienceless wretch who by a diabolical devise, throws an express train from the track. Life is to be made up of right or wrong, or of both. The greatest encouragement must be given for the free and independent exercise of reason—the mind should receive the most wholesome discipline and development.

The study of languages improves memory in a healthful direction. Mr. Spencer disparagingly intimates that one could do the same thing by collecting an immense store of worthless facts, as all the gossip of several townships. The position is unworthy such a thinker. The fallacy is easily exposed. The position assumes there is no difference in the kinds of facts and data to be memorized—that is that all ideas are the same, which is absurd. But not only is the memory strengthened healthily in the study of languages, the mind is subjected to good discipline and the judgment continually exercised. Observation is encouraged and discrimination is sharpened. Gœthe has said: "*Wer fremde Sprachen nicht kennt, weiss nichts von seiner eigenen.*"—He who knows not foreign languages knows nothing of his own." The study of philology, so useful to the world, could not be pursued without classical training. While I do not go so far as to say no one can become an educated man without the study of languages, I do say he cannot become so well educated without them as with them.

Mathematics no one disallows. The relations of numbers and their importance, all seem to appreciate. Yet Arithmetic and the elements of Algebra bound the mathematical acquirements of the greater part of our so-called educated ladies and gentlemen. To mathematics society owes, in one way or another, its greatest possessions. Along its imperial causeway the mind gathers peculiar and intensified powers. Reasoning, attention, discipline, power, concentration of thought, independence of thought—all the mental faculties are brought into exercise and they are strengthened.

Then Science! Who can over-estimate its worth? The world owes its being to Science. In its widest significance it comprehends all. It is almost the *omnis, omnis, omne*. But to praise science or to panegyrize its worth is inconsistent with the scope of

this essay. I cannot even enter upon the value of chemistry, botany, mineralogy, geology, metereology, ethnology, biology, sociology, zoology, psychology, etc., all important, and they constitute inexhaustible stores of satisfaction and useful enjoyment, and to the educated man they are capital and profit.

Empirical knowledge of the effects of light, heat, moisture, seasons, agriculture, hoing and stock-raising is advantageous and in many cases proves to be the only capital. And here and there measurable success attends such knowledge; but how insignificant it is, when compared with an exhaustive scientific knowledge of these things! Empirical knowledge is too limited. The mind is capable of so much that no one should be happy with little in it. Extend the horizon of your thinking till you take in the universe, or at least make an effort to do it. There are minds like uncarpeted rooms, with here and there a piece of uncouth furniture, a broken chair, the floor unswept and the mantel-piece all dusty; the walls are dank and cobwebs are drawn in the corners; the hearth is unsightly and its ornaments are rude pictures drawn by children with pieces of charcoal. There are other minds like well-kept drawing rooms. Everything is in order and there is order in everything. Useful articles of furniture, combining qualities of convenience and beauty are around you. The floor is well protected and glorified. The hearth reflects cheerfulness and comfort, and appears to invite you. The mantel-piece is ornamented with joy and taste. Rare pictures grace the walls to please, instruct and delight.

Upon entering the first you see all at a glance and you are ready to retire; upon entering the second, you are in the midst of variety, instruction, entertainment and delight, and you wish to remain. But, perhaps I may better express myself in the language of another. "Little minded people's thoughts move in such small circles that five minutes' conversation gives you an arc long enough to determine their whole curve. The arc in the movement of a large intellect does not sensibly differ from a straight line."

Then let education be ample. Give your boy principles. Teach him they are his. Show him there is dignity and supremacy in his free use of them. Do not dwarf his mind with routine or rote. Do all you can to make him an educated man. Teach him that a doctrine or thought held by his ancestors or by anybody else is, from that fact no reason why he should or that anybody else should. Tell him not to conform to any fashion of body or mind

because his father, mother or instructor does. Teach him to investigate, to seek truth, to learn what is right and that he must do this or that, pursue this or that course because it is truth, because it is right. Impress on his mind the importance of the distinction between right ideas and wrong ideas; that where principle, right, truth, goodness and honor lead he must go; that such ideas must be appropriated, they must be lived, and if death should confront him, that rather than swerve, he must die.

Be patient in instilling into his mind a supreme love for the beautiful, the true and the good. Thus being dignified, fortified, harmonized and glorified, he may rise in pride above the petty bickerings and snares of ignorance, and in the clear heaven and pure elysian of independent, liberated manhood, which is near all and accessible to all, he may rest his life. Upheld by knowledge and truth, he may catch upon his invigorated spirit reflections of divinity like the eagle in its wide-spread, untiring flight, catches upon its wings the beams of the inextinguishable sun.

If I have not specially emphasized moral culture it must not be presumed that I would have it neglected. I have said that the threefold nature must be harmoniously developed, and this could not be done unless the moral powers are carefully educated. To develop the physical powers to the neglect of the intellectual and moral is to make an animal; but an ass is an animal. To develop the physical and intellectual to the neglect of the moral, may make an expert bank-robber or a defaulter; but never a true man and good citizen. The harmonious development of all three to manhood is to make an educated man. The cultivation of the moral nature alone, is to make a sickly hypochondriac or a blind worshiper. To attend to the intellectual and moral with no care for the physical may make a fanatic or an inquisitor as well as a fading light at the shrine of truth. To look to the physical and moral alone is to make a hardy Puritan but never a philanthropist nor a lover of universal truth. From all this I deduce my other definition of an educated man to be one whose physical, intellectual and moral powers are harmoniously developed. This conclusion is not at all inconsistent with a former conclusion, since only then is one prepared to discriminate between right and wrong ideas; to appropriate the true, to reject the false, in a word it is by a harmonious development of man's threefold powers that he is prepared to live successfully.

It is urged by one of our advanced thinkers that we should not expect too high a conception of right and wrong in children: "Not only is it unwise to set up a high standard for juvenile good conduct, but it is even unwise to use very urgent incitements to such good conduct. Already most people recognize the detrimental results of intellectual precocity; but there remains to be recognized the truth that there is a moral precocity which is also detrimental. Our higher moral faculties, like our higher intellectual ones, are comparatively complex. By consequence they are both comparatively late in their evolution. And with the one as with the other, a very early activity produced by stimulation will be at the expense of the future character. Hence the not uncommon fact that those who during childhood were instanced as models of juvenile goodness, by-and-by undergo some disastrous and seemingly inexplicable change, and end by being not above but below par; while relatively exemplary men are often the issue of a childhood by no means so promising."

"Be content, therefore with moderate measures and moderate results." Moral growth, like physical and intellectual, is gradually developed. Precocity of any power is to be feared—it is abnormal—some law is unduly taxed or stimulated. Education should begin early to restrain what is necessary to be curbed, and, to excite healthfully what requires stimulation. And this requires no less care and judgment than it does to discover what is to be restrained and what is to be stimulated. Harshness, beating, threatening, frequent scoldings, abuse and corporal chastisement may prevent given offenses while the subject is *in terrorem*, but such procedure never builds up a high type of character. And although some noble exceptions will struggle up and attain to eminent distinction in spite of such education, yet who may estimate the eternity of injury inflicted by such a course? Scoldings, threatenings, forbiddings and beatings react and the oftener indulged the oftener must they be used.

The delicate, sensitive organism of the child calls for the gentlest and tenderest care. To deal with it otherwise, is, as if a florist should strike with heavy hoe angrily, at the weeds growing about the roots of some rare and delicate exotic.

"See the sole bliss Heaven could on all bestow!
Which who but feels can taste, but thinks can know;
Yet poor with fortune and with learning blind

The bad must miss, the good untaught will find;
Slave to no sect, who takes no private road,
But looks through nature up to nature's God;
Pursues that chain which links th' immense design,
Joins Heaven and earth, and mortal and divine;
Sees that no being any bliss can know
But touches some above, and some below:
Learns from the union of the rising whole
The first, last purpose of the human soul;
And knows where faith, law, morals, all began
All end in love of God and love of man."

Such will be the bliss, such the fortune, such the freedom, such the comprehensiveness of his soul, such his progressive course, such the wisdom, such the moral sublimity and such the godlike properties of the educated man.

Do you say this ideal is too difficult to be realized? It is not difficult and yet it is. "Nothing harder if one knows not how to will it; nothing easier if one wills it."

We may not know whether a man's infancy was properly directed and his education continued aright. We may not know of his antecedents. We may not know of his instructors, if he had any. Yet we should be able to tell if he is an educated man. How? What are the criteria? To answer these questions is to reverse the point of view, from which we have been looking. The child acquiring his education is no longer the object of vision, but the matured, educated man.

I observe that he may possess the highest scholastic attainments, or he may not. This depends on the use to which such attainments are applied. The pathway of the world's history is strewn with examples illustrating this truth. What a sad truth it is that among poets whose fire has warmed the hearts of millions many have proved wrecks or failures in all except their sphere of poesy. Among statesmen, orators, politicians and men of letters, where we should not expect such examples, yet do we find them.

Is this tarnishment of genius to be attributed to the fact, that those possessing it were thus gifted? Yes and no. Yes, because of the extraordinary development of some peculiar power to the neglect of others; no, because the best educated may be so gifted without injury, nay to their advantage.

If genius is not counterbalanced by powers equably developed

it may become all the more deplorable because it is genius, overthrown and obscured—a bright jewel at last bedimmed and lost in the squalor of attendant irregularities—a basket of rich fruit set in a quagmire. Among the noble exceptions are statesmen, orators, politicians, as well as poets. Fame has not heard of all.

“Many are poets who have never penned
 Their inspirations, and perchance the best:
 They feist, and loved, and died, but would not lend
 Their thoughts to meaner beings; they compressed
 The god within them, and rejoined the stars
 Unlaurell'd upon earth, but far more blest
 Than those who are degraded by the jars
 Of passion, and their frailties link'd to fame,
 Conquerors of high renown, but full of scars.”

Therefore, while scholastic acquirements neither make nor prevent education, they are inestimable when existing under regulations founded on harmonious development.

Industry is an essential quality of an educated man. Laziness is said to be the parent of every vice. Laziness begets littleness, and littleness is no part of an educated man. Prudence is wisdom in action and is the enemy of folly. Our ideal, therefore, should be a prudent man, for if he is given to folly he does not discriminate between the true and the false—the right and the wrong. If he have not prudence his judgment is vitiated. Punctuality in thought and in action may not be dispensed with. “The unpunctual woman, like the unpunctual man, becomes disliked, because she consumes our time, interferes with our plans, causes uneasy feelings, and virtually tells us that we are not of sufficient importance to cause her to be more punctual. To the business woman it is more—it is peace, comfort and domestic prosperity.”

If this is true, and no one can say it is not, this quality requires to be expressed in our definition for an educated man—one who knows how to live successfully and does it.

Good manners and temperance are necessary qualities. By the first I do not mean etiquette merely. Etiquette is changeable and conventional—it is going by rule, and I have already indicated that rules must be subordinated to principle. Etiquette may be hollow and false; not so good manners. “Etiquette is a liar in its ‘not at home,’ ordered to be told by servants to callers at inconvenient seasons. Good manners are not acquired by rule, but by careful train-

ing and the inculcation of sound principles and reciprocal obligations. Politeness, kindness, courtesy, neatness, order, method, tact, and above all gentlemanliness belong to good manners, and characterize an educated man. Such qualities are opposed to all that go to make roughs, boors or clowns.

Not only must the educated man be temperate in the common and narrow meaning, but temperate in his judgment that he may not degenerate to an enthusiast merely; temperate in thought that he may not become unreliable; and temperate in morals that he may avoid fanaticism.

The control of temper is another feature and essential quality. The product of this tends to happiness received and given. There is an inextinguishable light ever about it, and all in its circumference receives cheerfulness, beauty, charity, forbearance and peace.

The educated man ought to be one of tact and thrift. He should be able to manage his own affairs, adapt himself to circumstances and to overcome the common obstacles that oppose a successful life. Greenc, Peele and Marlow were thriftless and dissipated. Milton died in obscurity, Lovelace in a cellar, Butler of starvation, Savage in prison, and DeFoe was continually involved in broils. Johnson was a poor but a brave man. He never knew what wealth is. His mind and heart were always greater than his fortune. He was characterized for "sobriety, self-restraint and self-respect." He tried to make the best of everything and generally succeeded. He rarely if ever despaired. He was a philosopher. When reduced to penury, and when brought to most torturing poverty, he said, "A man may live in a garret at eighteen pence a week; few people would inquire where he lodged; and if they did, it was easy to say, 'Sir, I am to be found at such a place.' By spending three-pence in a coffee-house, he might be for some hours every day in very good company."

Certainly, this has the ring of genuine philosophy. Men must "learn to labor and to wait."

In some of our cities, young men of ambition and of moderate means—young men who possess many of the qualifications we require—young men struggling to gain a footing in a professional career, must avail themselves of cheap eating-houses, and, in some cases, resort to free-lunch rooms. If they should be wanting in development and healthful self-denial, they may fall in the snares, besetting such places; but others will pass through all the stronger

from the ordeal. When the footing is gained the latter stand as a strong man to run a race. The survival of the fittest is demonstrated.

Tact is a word of only four letters and yet it is a very large word. *It is educated management.* Sometimes it appears to be an inspired adaptedness. Adversity may threaten portentously and dark wings obscure the sun of life but tact comes to the rescue just in time; if overtaken it rescues through the only avenue making escape possible, in the very moment and the very manner, in which it could be done. Now I say this wonderful property is an acquirement rather than a gift. It is a result of evenly balanced powers, properly developed; it is the ability to elect the true and not the false, the right and not the wrong; harmony, not discord; good, and not evil. But such an election as this is necessary to a successful life. Therefore, it is a characteristic of an educated man. But since an educated man may be made, tact must be a result of a true education.

An educated man is not influenced by sordid considerations and selfishness. His heart is large, his mind comprehensive. He does not live for himself alone, but for the good and happiness of others as well. His life is not bounded by the horizon of the present; but his eye is on the future. He is ever ready to sacrifice the pleasures of the *now* to enrich the *hereafter*.

There are pigmy minds more real than a pigmy race. Some live in a world of such circumscribed selfishness that their dwarfed spirits might fly for tens of millions of years across the disc of a sun no larger than a dime, without accomplishing the transit. The soul of an educated man does not belong to such a sphere. Indeed, what to the first are such boundless worlds are to the latter but infinitesimals floating in a sunbeam.

Philanthropy and the demands of society, requiring no surrender of principle, are not forgotten. He is alive to enterprises which are to inure to the good of society, the rising generation and that which is to follow. His great soul and thought are universal in their functions; they are not grooved in conformity to narrow channels, nor to be perspicuous only in the riding of the hobbies.

Being free he is liberal; untrammelled he is generous; philanthropic, he is a true man; not sordidly selfish, he is true to himself and others; a lover of the beautiful and true, he approaches godli-

ness; a promoter of good, making life successful and happy, he is an educated man.

Such a man is not dependent on the follies of life to drive away care, nor to find enjoyment. The eternal hills are not more secure than his peace. The universe is his country, the world is his home, and his friend is God.

By increasing the joys of others, he adds to his own. His life is real progress, day by day. He is a toiler and he is ever reaping the reward of his labor. The world may call him poor, but he knows he is in a world of genuine wealth, where all is his. The world may call him rich. Close up all avenues for him to do good, and he is then poor.

The sun of true knowledge lights up his whole life. He is a light himself that cannot be hid. His praises may never be fully sung here; but in the great Beyond, eternity will speak the loveliness and true greatness of his character with unspeakable and increasing rapture. Do you say I have drawn an ideal too refined or impracticable? Again I answer, "You have but to will it; nothing easier if one wills it."

The world is full of information. Every one may, at least, possess a modicum; no one can appropriate it all. Every one may be trained to acquire a portion. Every one may be taught how to occupy a position where "eternal sunshine will settle on his head" if he will but make the effort.

It does not require the highest scholastic learning, though this properly acquired, is an engine of enormous power which it is criminal to abuse. It places one on high vantage ground and subjects to his bidding principalities and powers. His strength is superhuman, but

"O, it is excellent

To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous

To use it like a giant."

And this is the great responsibility under which every scholar rests. This responsibility becomes heavier as he advances in the fields of learning. Yet this affords no ground for hesitation on his part to assume it. Not to educate, is fast becoming a crime, if it is not one already.

No parent can be a true citizen and neglect the mind of his child. No citizen has the right to deny our present civilization the influence of his life for the cause of education. No one can be freed

from this duty except in its discharge. If he would prove a friend to good and stable government, he must perform this duty; if he loves pure society, elegant manners and refinement, he must perform it; if he would reflect the spirit of the age, he must perform it; if he would advance the material interest of his community, he must perform it; if he would help to elevate man and give his influence for light, for truth, for the amelioration of evil, and for the higher refinements of the age, he must perform it. No one can be an indifferent spectator. If he does not step out in the golden sunshine of knowledge, of the good and true, it will be determined for him that he stands in darkness or gropes in ignorance.

Higher conceptions of man's capabilities and possibilities are entertained now than in the mediæval ages of the world's thought or than ever heretofore. No one now advocates pounding a boy over the head to make him a receptacle of truth and knowledge. Man is a rational being now and not an animal merely. The theory, with its practice, that there is a better nature, to which successful appeal may be made, is fast obtaining. The experience of all true educators bears evidence supporting the fact that a youth continually threatened, ill-used and abused, becomes degraded in his own esteem if not in others. He becomes less capable of becoming a true man. It is also a significant fact, equally as well supported, that many whose sensibilities were accounted dead, have, under properly directed appeals to manhood and honor, aroused themselves and come forth as redeemed spirits to enjoy the unutterable delights, consequent on such a resurrection.

This outlines to you, though a digression, how this true education should be connected. My observation and experience are in accord with the theory advanced. I entertain but feeble hope for the young man or lady whom you can inspire with no emulation, no love for truth, no desire of excellence without resorting to threat, intimidation or abuse.

The highest education inspires a supreme love of truth, the beautiful and good, because whatever is opposed to them is opposed to him, and he is opposed to them. To reach a high plane of this kind is to stand where you can see into the heaven of perfection and catch in your soul music divine and so ethereal, duller natures cannot distinguish it. This is to be enabled to go into the world to meet its realities, its temptations and difficulties panoplied in heaven's armor. The man who stands on such an exalted summit

is no longer a subject of the tyrant ignorance. He has true knowledge—he is free indeed; and to be free is to reach the highest earthly distinction, ready to begin aright that which is to come. Such an educated man is great because he is good; he is good because he loves the good; he loves the good because this makes his life the greatest success. He elects ideas that are right and true and beautiful because they are right, true and beautiful. He rejects the wrong, the false and incongruous, because they are wrong, false and incongruous. He lives far above the petty annoyances of other men. He has drunk of the fountain whose waters are no fabled elixir of immortality. He has caught the light eternal through the half-opened portals glowing, and he reflects heavenly radiance on others. His look is ever upward. Science throws her doors wide open to him and invites him a welcome guest and bids him gather more from her exhaustless stores. Nature spreads her resources before him to entertain, to instruct and to enoble. He communes with her in her most inspiring moods. He has learned the divinest speech that ever gave expression to immortal aspirations. His soul is borne on wings that strike only in an atmosphere of purity and truth. Thus borne and endowed with such a speech, he communes with God.

You think the picture over wrought? Not if there is a government founded on truth and right; not if man is not a mere animal to lie down in the valley and die like the wolf; not if the instinctive nature and impulses of the soul are not given to mock and deceive; not if the evil may be shunned and the good pursued.

Life is accounted useful, successful, as it conforms to the right; it is accounted worthless, a failure, as it conforms to the wrong. To live the one and not the other is man's highest duty and requirement. If all may not reach the highest degree indicated, all can approximate to it. Every one can become educated. Some well, some better, some best; but none need fail. When this consummation is attained, it will create a new heaven and new earth. The mild sceptre of universal love and right will prevail over the heart and mind of man. His highest destiny will be reached; he will bless the world and the world will bless him. The history of the world will be easily written. Joy will float in every breeze. The approbation of Heaven will everywhere be seen, and the regenerated heart of the world will beat in responsive joy. Universal love will reign supreme, and "the charming air" will repay with "thousand ordors from his dewy wings."

J. W. ELLIS.

WERE THE BIBLE AND ITS RELIGION PLAGIARIZED FROM OTHER RELIGIONS AND THEIR SACRED BOOKS, LEGENDS AND MYTHS?

The field of thought covered by this query is comparatively new and unexplored. In the past, Christian thought has been content to assume certain positions in regard to the issues involved in the query, and generally without much investigation. The wish was father to the thought advanced, and as a necessary consequence, many of these positions were entirely incorrect, and nearly all were partially erroneous. For several years there has been great activity in explaining and investigating everything that will throw light on the origin of mankind, races, languages and civilization; or all that is embraced in ethnology, anthropology, philology, archæology, comparative religion and kindred topics. In many cases these researches have been prosecuted by the skeptic with the hope and ulterior design of overthrowing the Bible and its religion. Great fears have been entertained by some timid believers, that these investigations would result in injury to the Bible and its religion, and such fears prevail to some extent yet. So it was once feared that researches in regard to various readings of different MSS. of the Bible, and in regard to the queries, "Who wrote the Scriptures" and "How they come down to us unchanged," would result in the triumph of skepticism. The learned and pious Bengel died under a cloud of odium and suspicion, for prosecuting such investigation.

Such suspicions can only be the offspring of cowardice and lack of faith. If Christianity be true, investigation will only make its truth more apparent. Such has been the result invariably, thus far, of all investigations in regard to the origin of the Scriptures. We have at least fifty-fold more evidence now, than we had fifty years ago; and many kinds of evidence that we did not then have. In like manner, the results of investigation, in comparative religion, archæology and all these fields of research, have been a triumph for the Bible and its religion. "The Hymn of Creation," or the ac-

count of creation given in Genesis, has been corroborated by archaic traditions of Accad, Chaldea, and all ancient peoples of Asia, Africa, America and even the isles of the sea. The Scriptural account of the events in Eden, such as man's primitive innocence, pristine vigor of body, longevity, angelic intercourse, and his transgression, and consequent loss of innocence, loss of angelic intercourse, loss of vigor of body and loss of longevity, have been sustained by universal archaic traditions. So have the traditions preserved in the Bible, in regard to the civilization of the first generations, the Deluge, and the unity and common origin of races and language. Tribes, races and nations have been traced to one parent stem, and into Southwestern Asia. Movements of races can be traced to one cradle of the race, in Southwestern Asia, from which all proceeded. Archaic traditions, found all over the world, can be traced to one source, in Southwestern Asia. Religions can be traced to one primitive religion, a simple monotheism, in Southwestern Asia. Archaic researches, in all departments, corroborate and sustain the traditions of man's career, from Adam to Abraham, that are recorded in Genesis. This is especially true of the accounts of the origin and migrations of nations, as Prof. Rawlinson shows in his "Origin of Nations." These researches, prosecuted in Palestine, Syria, Assyria, Babylonia, Arabia and Egypt, have brought up from Nineveh, Babylon and Assyrian ruins, from Baalbec and Palmyria, from the cities of Moab, Midian, Idumea and Phoenecia, from the hieroglyphics, the sarcophagi and papyrus rolls of Egypt, the stones of Moab, the rocks of desert and mountain, the bricks of Assyria, and the hoary relics of Accad and Calnek, and of Cushite and Hittite civilizations, corroborative proofs that brought the first chapters of Genesis fourth out of the mists and morning twilight of history, in which they so long had stood, and in which they were so dimly seen, and understood; till now they stand out in the clear light of history, a historic record, with an amount of corroborative proof, that no ancient record can claim.

The traditions, monuments and ruins, archæological records of the nations around the Israelites, the archaic fragments of Southwestern Asia, Northeastern Africa, and of Southeastern Europe, sustain the historic Genesis, the history in the Pentateuch and all Hebrew history. They interlock with, and dovetail into, Biblical history at almost every salient angle; and in almost every generation they narrate some of the events recorded in Biblical history.

The Bible grew up in the manner it claims, and in the surroundings that it claims enveloped it, in Southwestern Asia, each portion, in the age and surroundings claimed for it. It dovetails into places, times, customs, persons, nations and all particulars, with all the countless minutiae, minute and undesigned co-incidences, possible only in literal history. The fuller's web does not fit the tenter hooks, on which it was stretched, more exactly, than the Bible history fits the surroundings in which it claims that it transpired.

This history is a vital and wonderful portion of universal history and runs parallel with other cotemporaneous portions of universal history and interlocks with them. It records a most important portion of universal history, with all the minutiae and particularity of an eye witness, in regard to customs, times, places, etc. It could not thus fit into parallel history, and dovetail with it, in every particular unless it grew up in such position and relations. The Bible testifies with all the life-like minutiae and confident manner of an eye witness, and not with the caution of fiction. All this has been made clear by research, and evidence is increased by every act of research.

But it is our purpose, in this essay, to compare Christianity and other religions. The skeptic makes such comparison, to prove that the Bible and its religion are plagiarism, from pre-existent systems, to prove that Christianity is not superior to other systems, to prove that indeed it is inferior to some, to prove that it is the product of unaided human nature, like all other religions, to destroy the evidence based on the peculiar nature of Christianity, its uniqueness. The line of argument presented in the Chautauqua Normal Course would avail but little with a skeptic, in proving the inspiration of the Scriptures, and that their religion is a revelation. He would bring forward other religions, and claim such similarity as to show that, if man could originate *them*, as Christians claim he did, he could originate Christianity, that so closely resembles them; and would claim that since Christianity is so similar to other religions it is not superior to them. We must, by a careful study of Christianity and other religions, establish the very things that the Lesson Papers assume, or the skeptic will reply: "The believers of other religions can make the same claims for their religions, and with as much justice. Why not accept them, on the same evidence that you do Christianity, for they have as much evidence."

We must make a new, thorough and exhaustive examination of

Christianity and other religions, and make an impartial judicial comparison of them, for two reasons:

1. That we may be able to take correct positions in regard to them, and know, and be able to prove what we claim to be true, and not expose ourselves to censure and defeat, by ignorance and erroneous positions.

2. That we may be able to compare Christianity with other religions intelligently and fairly, and demonstrate the superiority and excellence of Christianity. Before entering upon such a work, let us discard certain errors that have been current in the religious world and have been regarded as essential to a defense of the divine origin of Christianity, and the pre-eminent proofs of its divine origin. They are utterly untenable, and believers are sure to be defeated in taking them, and the result is that a defeat on these untenable positions, assumed in defense of Christianity, is regarded as an overthrow of Christianity.

We should not claim, that without revelation, man would never have had any religion or religious ideas; any morals or moral ideas. Such a position makes religion not only superhuman but unhuman and foreign to man's nature. Man as certainly has a religious and moral element in his nature, as he has a social element, and it will as certainly have its expression in moral and religious ideas, and in moral and religious systems, as the social element will have expression in social ideas and systems. Revelation does not implant within man's nature a new and foreign element, or create a religious element within man's nature. On the contrary it, like all truth, appeals to an element in his nature; is based upon it, develops it, educates and leads it aright. So Paul clearly teaches in the first and second chapters of his Roman letter. So David declares in the XIX Psalm. So the Bible ever teaches. It can be shown that man cannot attain to correct ideas of God's attributes, especially of his moral attributes, the very ones he must know in order to be saved from sin; nor what these moral attributes require of him; that he cannot attain to correct ideas of religion and morality, and cannot originate a perfect system of religion or morals, such systems as will save him from sin. Hence he needs revelation, not to implant a religious nature, but to educate the religious nature with which his Creator endowed him in creation. Revelation is a teacher, not a creator.

This argument, once so famous, and once so relied on, is a

palpable error, and like all error, is a boomerang that wounds only the one who ignorantly uses it. Persons use it, thinking that it settles forever the fact that man must have a revelation before he can have a moral or religious idea, and since he has moral and religious ideas he has, of necessity, had a revelation, and of course there is a God who made such revelation. It would prove all this if it were true, but it would make religion unnatural, and would utterly destroy all basis for human responsibility. It is opposed to the clear teachings of the Scriptures, and false in fact, when we examine man's nature, and equally false when we appeal to human history.

172 It should not be claimed, as is generally done, that all other religions and their books, are plagiarisms from the Bible and its religion. Some of them originated long before the writing of the oldest book of the Bible, and some portions of their sacred books are as old certainly as the oldest book of the Bible, and very probably older. The traditions recorded in these fragments are as old as the traditions recorded in Genesis, and are in fact, different versions of the same tradition. The circumstances are such as to forbid all idea of plagiarism from the Bible. It should not be claimed that no religion, except that of the Bible, had its origin in revelation, and that the Bible and its religion alone, of all sacred books and religions, contain revelation. The true position we have already indicated.

Mankind had one origin in southwestern Asia, and had, as all old ethnic religions, archaic traditions, philology and archaeology declare, one primitive religion, a simple monotheism. He had at first, as the necessities of his condition for years after creation demanded, angelic care and instruction and revelation. Man began with revelation. No matter how perfect in mental constitution, man began in absolute ignorance, for knowledge is acquired by exercise of the faculties, and in no other way than by angelic care and revelation, could man have existed till he acquired sufficient knowledge and experience to be able to take care of himself. There was one race, one language, simple government, simple civilization, one set of historic traditions, one religion, a simple monotheism, based on one set of simple revelations. When mankind migrated from this abode of the race, they carried with them this religion, these revelations, and these historic traditions, or at least portions of them. These were the basis of the religions that they afterwards con-


structed for themselves. All the old ethnic religions contained fragments of this primitive religion and revelation, and these primitive traditions.

It should not be claimed, as is so often done by religious writers and speakers, that all religions except that of the Bible, and that all sacred books except the Bible, are, in every feature, the work of the devil, and that they are in every idea and feature false and impure; or, that they have no good in them, have done no good, and have been productive of evil alone, nor that Christianity is necessarily antagonistic to every idea and feature in them. All of them contain some good, some truth, and some of them much good and much truth, and often grandly expressed. Christianity agrees with all that is good and true in each and all of them. Paul in his writings and preaching accepted all that was good and true in the religions and philosophies of Greeks and Romans, appealed to it, and used it as a basis for his introduction of the perfect truth of Christianity. Our Savior accepted and used all that was good in the teachings of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. Indeed his teaching harmonized with nearly all the teachings of the Essenes. Then it should not be claimed, in our comparison of other religions with Christianity, that there no truths, no correct ideas, no goodness, no morality in other religions, and that they have never produced good, but always evil, in their influence. Some of them contain nearly every basic idea of religion and morality, and nearly every religion contains at least germ conceptions of them. Some of them contain grand conceptions of most of the basic ideas of religion and morality. This is true of the religions and philosophies of China, Japan and India, especially of Buddhism and of Brahmanism in its primitive purity; also of Zend-Avestasim of Persia, of the philosophy of the priests of Egypt and Chaldea, the teachings of Epictetus, Socrates, Solon, Lycurgus, Plato, Seneca, Aurelius and of the ancient religions of Europe, of the Peruvians and other American Indians.

There were errors, erroneous conceptions of the basic ideas of religion, corruptions of them, and false, impure and evil ideas in these religions, but parading these faults as all that these religions taught, and ignoring the good that was in them, as most Christians do, is pettifoggery and gross misrepresentation, and not fair judicial investigation. That is the course skepticism pursues when attacking Christianity, and Christians, who have suffered so many times

from such caricatures of their religion, should not practice the same dishonesty in investigating other religions. Nothing is gained, but everything is lost by taking the position that these religions are totally false and corrupt, and produce nothing but evil, for it is untrue. Nothing is gained except to satisfy bigotry and partisan prejudice, and that is sure to be followed by defeat, when Christian apologists resort to such unjust disparagements of other religions. In deciding what are the real teachings of these systems, we should take as the standard, the basic ideas of the systems, especially as they are expressed by their founders and master minds; and not merely the lives and views of some of their adherents, especially the worst cases we can select. We should not cull out the errors as indicating the character of the systems, and ignore the good in them. Above all we should not cull out the lives of followers, and errors in their teachings, that are in violation of the great teachings of the systems, and insist that they are the system or its real results. We insist that men take the teachings of Christ, and not the errors and misconduct of Christians, as Christianity. Let Christians be as fair to other systems. Let truth, honesty and justice control all our investigations and comparisons.

It should not be claimed that after the calling of Abraham, none but his tribe had the primitive monotheism that God revealed to all men at first; nor that none but the tribe of Abraham had inspiration, inspired men, revelation and worshiped the true God, and had intercourse with him. The Bible flatly contradicts all such assumptions. All nations, in the days of Abraham, had more or less of this primitive monotheism; the religion of the Antediluvian and Patriarchal dispensations was still their religion, although more or less corrupted with idolatry. Nearly all nations and tribes still had their inspired men, revelation and primitive monotheism for centuries after Abraham and even Moses, and until the time of Christ. The cases of Melchizedek, Bethuel, Laban, the inspired visions and ideas of the Abimelechs and Pharaohs, with whom Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and their sons had intercourse, the dreams of Pharaoh's butler and the case of Jethro, the Midianite, prove that these nations had inspired men, revelation, and retained the primitive monotheism, the religion of the Patriarchal Dispensation. The case of Balaam who prophesied in the days of Moses, 700 years after Abraham, the Kenites, Hittites, the Rechobites and other tribes that associated with the Israelites, prove that the Patriarchal



religion did not cease with the calling of Abraham, except with the descendents of Jacob. The Bible contains proof, in the history it gives, in nearly every generation, that other nations besides the Israelites, retained the idea of God, and portions of primitive monotheism and revelation, till the time of Christ. The visions of Laban, the Abimelecks, Pharaohs, the butler and baker, Balaam, the Midianite soldier, of Nebuchadnezzar, the visit of Jonah to Ninevah and the reception of his preaching monotheism, the case of Pilate's wife, of Cornelius, and the many instances of other nations consulting the prophets of Jehovah and accepting their utterances; and the case of the Magi at the birth of Christ, all prove that the entire world did not entirely go out into idolatry as soon as Abraham and his tribe were chosen as God's Normal School; nor did they lose all inspiration and revelation then. Indeed such a state of affairs never obtained in human history. God did not reprobate all mankind, except the Israelites, and become their implacable enemy and only deal with them to visit his wrath on them. Such an idea is as repugnant to Bible teachings as to common sense. He was as much the God of other nations, in his national providences, as of the Israelites, except in the mission he had committed to them.

It should not be claimed that revelation and the religion inculcated by it, must be unhuman, unnatural, utterly repugnant to human nature and utterly opposed to its utterances and promptings. It is opposed to all errors and corruptions of human nature, not to human nature itself, nor to truth evolved by a right use of human nature. This claim, based on the old dogma of total hereditary depravity, now relegated to the bats and moles of the anchorite's cell in which it had its origin, should be sent to keep its parent company. It should not be claimed that the religion of the Bible is not like other religions in many of its features; nor that it is not like the best of them in nearly all essential features.

That argument for the divine origin of Christianity must be abandoned, or rather entirely reconstructed, placed on an entirely different basis, and entirely re-stated, for the skeptic can utterly refute it, as at present presented, by a comparison of other religions with Christianity. By thus making Christianity inhuman, unnatural and repugnant to our nature, we render impossible any rational or scientific basis for it, or the revelation containing it. If it be thus repugnant to our nature and hostile to the workings of reason and

our nature, then reason and our nature are justified in rejecting it, and would sin against themselves and commit suicide if they did not. It is outrageously absurd to claim that the author of our nature would give to it a certain constitution, and then present to it a revelation utterly repugnant to such constitution. Nor can we conceive that depravity can change the constitution of our nature. Depravity is a perversion of what was designed for goodness, and not a use of what is inherently evil. Such an argument to prove that the author of our nature has, in Christianity, revealed a religion and addressed it to our nature, is an outrage on reason. We concede that Christianity is opposed to all depravity of our nature, and still claim that it accords with a right use of our nature. So also the claim that religious ideas are so above our nature that man, without revelation, would have no religious ideas, must be abandoned. If this claim be true, all basis for human responsibility in regard to religion is removed. Revelation would be impossible unless a miracle was wrought, implanting a capacity to grasp and use religious ideas. All such positions are suicidal, for the infidel hoists those urging them, with their own petard.

The skeptic brings forward other religions and compares them with Christianity and makes several assertions: "1. The Bible and its religions were outgrowths of pre-existent Paganisms, and were plagiarized from them. 2. Christianity is, in all essential features, like all other religions, and if they are, as the Christian admits and claims, entirely of human origin, so is Christianity, for it does not differ from them in any essential feature. 3. Christianity is not unique, peculiar and unlike other systems, as its adherents claim. It is essentially similar to other religions. If, as Christians assert, man constructed other religions, he could have constructed Christianity."

This argument, so much relied on by Christians, that Christianity is unlike all systems that man has constructed, and does what man cannot do," the skeptic says "is untrue."

"4. Christianity is not superior to other systems, and there is no more reason for accepting Christianity, than for accepting other systems." 5. It is even asserted that "it is inferior to other religions and systems, the systems of Buddha, Confucius, Aurelius and others. Its results have been inferior to the results of the teachings of other systems." Let me suggest to all Christians that a Waterloo battle has to be fought on this field, and it has to be

done immediately. Let us, in this article, examine the claims of the skeptic that the Bible and its religion has been plagiarized from other systems.

I can, however, in so brief a space, only travel over the field and set up stakes, indicating the line of defense, and the works that will have to be thrown up. The skeptic attempts to establish his charge that the Bible and its religion were borrowed from other systems in two ways: 1. He assumes that the systems, from which he claims that the Bible was borrowed, are older than the Bible, and of course he asserts that it was borrowed from these older systems. 2. He calls attention to the resemblances between Christianity and other religions, and claims that it was borrowed from what it so closely resembles.

If the assertion of the priority of other religions means that other religions were older than the Hebrew religion, we reply that the Hebrew religion and all ethnic religions had their origin in the primitive monotheism that was the religion of mankind in the cradle of the race. The religion of the Bible is the divine continuation and development to perfection, of this primitive religion. Other religions are human elaborations and corruptions of this primitive religion. If the assertion of priority means that the sacred books of other religions are older than the oldest books of the Bible, we reply that such claim must be clearly proved, not merely asserted. There is a vast deal of assumption in regard to the age of the sacred books of other religions that has not a particle of basis in fact or testimony. There is a vast deal of assertion in regard to Moses having borrowed from other systems that is mere assertion. The claim of Hebrews and Christians that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, and of their system of laws and religion, is denied, and these books and their laws assigned to a much later age. This assertion must be proved. We cannot accept unquestioned the magisterial assertions and theories of German, Dutch and other neologists, especially since they have no basis of historic facts; but are based upon what is called internal criticism of the books themselves, and the theories are evolved out of the internal consciousness of the critics, in accordance with certain prejudices entertained by the critics before they began their work. Then, since these critics do not agree with each other in their theories and conclusions in a single instance, and are not only different, but often diametrically opposed to each other in theory and conclusion, and are not consis-

112

tent with themselves, we must hold their oracular assertions as about as reliable as the conjectures of theorists in regard to the Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley. There is more evidence for the claim made by Christians and Hebrews for the books of Moses, than for all the books of antiquity combined.

The great age that the infidel claims for the books of other religions, and especially for the features in which they resemble certain features of the Bible, must be proved. They have not a hundredth part of as much evidence as is presented for the Bible. So many of these claims of skeptics have been disproved, and they have had to abandon them so frequently, that great precaution should be exercised in accepting their assumptions. Hundreds of statements, once accepted as undeniable facts, in regard to the sacred books of Indian and other systems have been abandoned. Indeed, so intermingled are things of comparatively recent origin, with things of former ages, and so utterly unreliable are the assertions concerning the systems themselves; so frequent have been the changes and corruptions; and so persistently have these corruptions been ascribed to remote antiquity, that no reliance can be placed in the claims of Oriental systems, and less reliance can be placed in mere speculations of Orientalists in regard to them. Yet the skeptic will quote the assumptions of these systems and his own baseless speculations, assumed to discredit Christianity, as undeniable history or fact. He will do this in the face of the fact that countless similar assertions have been exploded, and even quote such exploded assertions.

We have accepted with altogether too easy credulity the magisterial assertions of skepticism in regard to other systems and their sacred books. Their assertions and theories should be criticised as their authors criticise the claims of the Bible. If the same criticism as the skeptics practice on the Bible and its claims, were practiced on other systems and their sacred books, and the claims of their believers for them, which he accepts unquestioned, and on his own speculation based upon them, it would not leave a shred of what he accepts as undeniable fact. The same evidence on which he accepts these things can be urged for the Bible, a thousand-fold more of it, and many kinds of evidence of a far higher character, that cannot be urged for them. The skeptic is a person of infinite credulity and infinite skepticism; infinite skepticism in regard to the overwhelming evidence for the Bible, and of infinite credulity in

regard to the baseless assumptions made in regard to other religions.

The best Orientalists now ascribe a comparatively recent origin to all extant Chinese, Japanese and Indian systems. The present form of no portion of their sacred books can be found to extend back more than twelve hundred years before Christ. Nearly all are undoubtedly of much later origin; nor can the older books or legends now lost, on which their books are based, be traced back further than two thousand years before Christ. So their present books are not older than Moses, nor are their traditions older than Abraham.

But if priority could be established, it would not prove plagiarism, that the Bible nor any feature of it was borrowed from them. Egyptian and Grecian systems were older than those of the Peruvians and Aztecs, yet there was no borrowing. The Chinese had printing, the mariner's compass and gun-powder, a thousand years before they were discovered in Europe. European genius discovered them by original research, and did not borrow them from China. Le Verrier and Adams in Astronomy, and Darwin and Wallace in Zoology, made the same discoveries independent of each other. Nor do resemblances prove borrowing. Systems that could not possibly have had any connection, resemble each other more closely than Christianity does any other system. The Peruvian and Persian systems thus resemble each other. Will it be claimed that Persia borrowed from Peru? The "*Popul Vuh*," composed by Indians in Central America, long before the discovery of America, resembles Milton's "*Paradise Lost*" more closely than the Bible does any other system. Did Milton borrow from the Indians, or the Indians from Milton? A Mexican King of the seventh century after Christ, in character and history, resembles in an astonishing manner the character and history of David, King of Israel. The resemblances strike one with amazement. Did the Mexican borrow from the Israelites or the Israelites borrow from the Mexicans?

The course of reasoning pursued by Infidels, when tracing resemblances and proving plagiarism in regard to the Bible, would prove all systems and books to be borrowed from each other. All animals could be proved to be descended from each other. The line of argument pursued, in that jumble of plagiarism, charlatan-ism, ignorance, falsehood and baseless assertions, Graves' "*The*

World's Sixteen Crucified Redeemers," could just as easily prove that every man and woman that ever lived was a "redeemer," and that each human being's career is plagiarized from every other human being's career. There are certain respects in which all men and their careers, all systems and their ideas, resemble each other. Plagiarism then cannot be established by such data as mere priority, could the priority be proved; nor by resemblances, even if they were real and not assumed, as is often the case, and if they were greater than they really are. The resemblances are usually such as are very common among men and systems. Finally, many instances can be cited of more wonderful and more numerous resemblances than any that have been traced between the Bible and other systems, where borrowing was utterly out of the question.

The entire charge of plagiarism can be set to one side and these resemblances accounted for very easily and in a very simple and rational manner. Men have a common religious nature; it will express itself in religious ideas and systems. These ideas and systems, having a common cause and source, will more or less resemble each other. If revelation be adapted to man it must be based on this religious nature of man and accord with it, as far as it is unperverted, and agree with the religious ideas evolved by man's religious nature and expressed in his systems, as far as they are correct. Man's religious nature will evolve more or less truth. Its utterances will not be utterly false. Revelation must necessarily agree with all truth evolved by man's religious nature and with all truths in his religion, and hence with many of the features of man's religion. This is one source of their resemblances, without any plagiarism on either side. Another source of resemblance has already been suggested. Mankind began, in the cradle of the race, with one religion, a simple monotheism and with one set of historic traditions. All ethnic religions were based on these, the religion of the Bible with the rest. The truth is that all ethnic religions, the Hebrew with the others, had one common origin, and are not plagiarisms, any one of them. Man wandered away from God and began to corrupt the religion God gave to all men at first. God continued the development of this religion among the Hebrews, but he based all he did among the Hebrews on this primitive monotheism. This explains the common historic traditions found all over the world, and accounts for many of the common features of the religion of the Bible and other old religions.

As we have already indicated, this line of thought will necessitate an abandoning of many favorite positions of old theology and a restatement of the defense of Christianity. The old positions, that revelation and the religion given by it, must be unhuman and foreign to human nature and utterly repugnant to it; that no religion but that of the Bible had any connection with revelation; that there is no revelation in any religion but that of the Bible; that other religions contain no truth; that they are utterly false and corrupt; that they have done no good but always evil; that the Bible and its religion are utterly opposed to every idea in them; all this must be abandoned. When we do this and take the position indicated, we take the position taught by the Bible and human history. The Bible claims to be based on human nature and to accord with a right use of it. It teaches that all old religions began in a common monotheism and that they had at first revelation and inspired men. This accounts for the similarity of old fragments of the Indian, Persian, Chaldean, Egyptian and other religions. I can read certain Vedic hymns before a Christian or Hebrew audience and certain Psalms from the Bible, and but few could distinguish between them. These hymns are fragments of primitive revelation. The course pursued by the Apostles proves that they accepted and utilized whatever good they found in Hebrew, Greek or Roman systems. They readily admitted the truth in them; they did not teach that Christianity was utterly opposed to every idea in them. Confucianism, Buddhism, Zend Avestaism, and nearly all of these systems have done great good. They contain much sublime truth, often grandly expressed. Christianity should recognize all truth and good in them, and concede it. It will not detract from the excellence of Christianity, nor weaken the evidence of its divine origin.

1113

The first specific argument for the charge of borrowing that we shall notice is the position of nearly all infidels, that man is an evolution from lower orders of animals; that he began in brutal instinctive animalism, and in a struggle for existence in which the strongest prevailed, he progressed through savagery into barbarism, and finally into civilization; and in religion, through fetichism and polytheism into monotheism, and is to end in a theism. This position assumes that monotheism is a development of pre-existent polytheism, and that polytheism is a development from pre-existent fetichism. The Bible and its religion, as well as all monotheisms.

and their sacred books, are outgrowths of pre-existent polytheisms, and in a certain sense plagiarisms from them. The claim that man is a development from lower animals has been so severely put to the proof, that even Tyndall says it is utterly unproved. There is no direct evidence of such evolution, and the chasm between man and the most highly developed animal has been made so immeasurable that we need spend no time on it. The theory that man began in animalism or savagery has not a particle of historic proof. It was assumed to complete the theory of evolution, and to meet the necessities of that theory. Research has proved that the different stages of civilization, and the use of clubs, stones, bronze and iron have been cotemporaneous as far back as history goes. Research has proved that quite a high state of civilization and mental culture have existed where men used stone and bronze implements, and that barbarians have used iron. Also that the use of bronze and stone have succeeded the use of iron in some cases. As we have already stated, researches in ethnology, philology, migration of races, origin of traditions, and in comparative religion and archaeology, prove that mankind had one origin in southwestern Asia, and that all states of society in the rest of the world are subsequent to the residence of man in southwestern Asia, and his migration from that region. The same researches place man before us in that cradle of the race, and before such migrations, as far back as we can trace him, comparatively civilized, with arts, government and religion, a monotheism. There is not a trace of pre-existent savagery or animalism, or of club and stone-using ages, in the cradle of the race; but all records we can get, utterly forbid such an idea.

A late Egyptologist, and indeed all Egyptologists of the present day, declare that the researches into the antiquities of Egypt clearly prove: 1. Much of the art and civilization of what is called the historic period of Egypt, came down from what is called the prehistoric period. 2. That much of this art and civilization was as perfect in what is called the prehistoric period, as it ever was in the historic. 3. That some of it was in a higher state in the prehistoric than in the historic. 4. That much, that was as wonderful as any art and civilization of the historic period, that existed in the prehistoric period, was lost. 5. That as far back as research can reach much of the most wonderful of Egyptian art and civilization was in its greatest perfection. The same holds true in re-

gard to Arabia and its Cushite civilization, Syria, Assyria and Babylonia. Back of these Chaldean, Hittite and old civilizations, stood an Accaddian civilization. The same is true in Persia, India and China. In Liberia, in Central Africa, in America, we find, back of all historic records, a wonderful civilization, as shown by archaic remains. The assumption that relics of savagery and barbarism found in these lands, preceded these relics of civilization, is without proof in any instance and is disproved in Egypt and southwestern Asia.

The assumption that monotheism was preceded by fetichism and polytheism is without proof. It is a mere assumption, to complete a theory, and to meet the necessities of the theory. As far back as authentic history goes, these forms of religion have been cotemporaneous. In many instances fetichism and polytheism have been known to follow monotheism. Comparative philology shows that man's oldest religious words were monotheistic. Research has proved that back of the polytheism and fetichism of the oldest religions, was a period of monotheism with no trace of anything back of it. This is especially true in Egyptian archaeology. It is now declared that all that is good and pure in the philosophy and history of the historic periods, came down from the prehistoric period. That it constituted the religion and philosophy of the prehistoric period, and was monotheistic. That the polytheism and fetichism of the historic period were corruptions of the purer, simpler system of monotheism of the prehistoric period. Researches in Arabia go back to the Cushite civilization in Assyria, Babylonia and Syria; to the Chaldaic and Hittite, and these back to the Accaddean civilization of Accad and Calneck, and these had a simple system of monotheism. Researches in India lead back to the simple monotheism of the pure Vedic hymns, given by the inspiration of primitive monotheism. Researches in China and Japan go back to a primitive monotheism; so do researches into the Pelasgic civilizations that preceded Grecian and Etruscan civilization in Europe.

The researches of Schlieman, Cesonola and others, have exploded many of the mythical theories of Ewald, Niebuhr, and German destructive criticism. It began by claiming to demonstrate that nearly all of Livy and early Roman history, most of Herodotus and early Grecian history, and certainly all of Homer and Hesiod was purely mythical. The same was true of all early

European, African and Asiatic history. But little of Assyrian, Syrian, Phœnician, Egyptian, Grecian and Roman history, previous to the third century before Christ, was reliable. Of course skepticism was not slow to apply such a destructive theory to the statements of the Bible. The Old Testament and the New were all mythical, according to them. But these researches have proved that nearly every statement in Homer in regard to places, persons and events, except the supernatural, is historic and true. The so-called myths of old histories are proved to be historic, and not mythical. The mythical theory is driven entirely out of many fields it occupied, and back thousands of years in all of them. Research has proved that the persons, places and events of the Bible are historic. The Pentateuch has been vindicated as truthful history, and the first portions of Genesis established as correct tradition of the infancy of mankind. Archaic records of all old races and nations, come up to sustain these traditions. Every day is adding to this testimony. The prospect is that these records will be demonstrated to be unimpeachable history. The records of the antediluvian period are thus corroborated. The account of the deluge and the record of events to the time of Abraham are now known to be history.

These traditions in Genesis teach that God gave revelation and inspiration to all tribes at first; He did not cast off or reject any one, but as Paul declares, they departed from God and rejected his revelation and inspiration. When man began thus hopelessly to corrupt the religion that God gave at first to all mankind, Jehovah continued the development of this religion in the family of Abraham. This was not an act of favoritism; Abraham had not rejected the primitive monotheism nor corrupted it with idolatry. As the tribe of Abraham was the only one that had not thus corrupted it, it was not partiality, but simple justice and common sense to continue in his tribe the development of this religion. Abraham was also, with all his faults, which were the faults of his age and people, one of the grandest characters of history. He was better suited to the work God committed to him, than any one living. There was no more injustice in continuing to perfection the development of this religion in the tribe of Abraham than there is in selecting suitable persons and educating them in a Normal School to be teachers of the entire youth of the state. On the contrary, such choice and education of teachers is an act of the greatest justice and benefit to

the entire State. So the establishment of God's Normal School, the Hebrew nation, was the best means of educating mankind, and was an act of the greatest benefit and justice to the entire race. If God had continued to give revelations to all mankind in small portions, and they could have received it in no other way, they would have continued to corrupt it faster than he could have instructed them in it, just as they had done for hundreds of years. Let a scientist attempt to impart science in that way to the 400,000,000 of China; all know what the result would be. The missionary has to educate a few, as many as he can, up to quite full knowledge, impart to them a system of instruction quite complete, preparing them by such teaching to grapple with and overcome error, and in time to teach as many as they can in like manner, and their pupils to continue the work until the entire mass is leavened. Normal Schools have to be separated from the mass of the community around them, as have all schools. The missionary has to separate his pupils from the mass, to prevent the corruption of his pupils and his system of instruction.

God pursued the same course in preparing to educate the race religiously. If we regard the Hebrews as God's Normal School, we have their mission in the career of humanity. As Muller, though a Rationalist, says: "To the Hebrews was committed the solution of the religious problem of humanity for the benefit of the race." Although Jehovah inspired men and gave revelations, and wrought miracles to attest inspiration and revelation, he can save men only by moral means, the power of truth. Moral change and regeneration can be accomplished in no other way. There is not one particle of regenerating power in a miracle or in the miraculous influence that constituted one an inspired person. All the power that God exerts for the regeneration of men is resident in truth. Man can be changed and regenerated in no other way. In giving revelation, Jehovah was educating, saving men, and he could accomplish this only by means of the regenerating power of truth. He began to give this truth to all men in revelation. When man rejected this revelation and wandered away from God, He could save him as a free moral agent only by the power of the truth. As Abraham did not abandon the primitive religion, God continued its development in his tribe. The Hebrews were God's Normal School. It was his purpose to preserve this religion from utter extinction, which, as we have shown, would have resulted from an

attempt to rely on its development among all men. Also to develop it into a perfect system of truth, able to grapple with and overcome the errors in the world; to train the Hebrews by such development to be the missionaries of this religion to the world.

In using the Hebrews, God wrought no miracles to re-create or miraculously change them. He took Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all his instruments, just as they were, and made the best use of them that human freedom and responsibility would permit. He so used the Hebrew people. He did not miraculously remove individual imperfections of mental or moral constitution or character, nor national errors and imperfections. Moral regeneration cannot be accomplished in that way. God accomplished all that could be accomplished by the influence of what truth they were then able to receive, and live out in their lives, and thus educated them to an ability to receive and live more and higher truth. He made, in this way, the best use that could be made of them as free moral agents, and did all that free moral agency would permit in regenerating them. While this work was being done among the Hebrews, other nations were attempting solutions of the soul problems of humanity, the family, arts, society, government, science, morals and religion; and were developing great truths, that Christianity, God's perfected teaching, could appeal to and use in converting the world. All nations were, in the providence of God, being prepared for the perfected religion when it should be completed. God was in all human history, ruling in and reigning over it, to accomplish these results. He did not utterly abandon and reprobate all nations except the Hebrews; He was still their Father in Heaven, though they knew it not. He was as much the God of other nations as of the Hebrews, except as he used the Hebrews to develop the religion of humanity, and he used them in that work for the good of all mankind.

This line of thought will sufficiently refute the assertion that the traditions in Genesis and the religion recorded in them were borrowed from older systems. Genesis contains the divine continuation and development of this primitive religion, and is not a plagiarism of it.

In another article we will examine the specific cases, that are the proof cases cited by infidels, to fasten plagiarism on the Bible.

CLARK BRADEN.

"THE FELLOWSHIP OF HIS SUFFERINGS."

"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." Phil. 3:10.

"Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Isa. 53:4-5.

"The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." The spirit of Christ is the genius of Christianity. While one of these statements is the divine epitome of a large part of the Old Testament, the other is a brief summary of the New. The one has been verified and attested by the fulfillment of prophecy in the coming and the going of Jesus, the other is being as fully attested in this age, at least, as there is a manifest turning away from the old standards of orthodoxy and from the warring of words about doctrines and tenets, as constituting the best exponents of deep religiousness, to the earnest and unceasing demand for the reproduction in the lives of Christians of that gracious spirit which must forever be the safest, the surest, yet the severest test of Christian doctrine and Christian character.

None ever appreciated this sentiment more fully than did the Apostle Paul, nor can we find a clearer expression of such a conviction than in these words: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus"; "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his"; "you have not so learned Jesus," &c. "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings," &c. His highest ideal of life was found in that wonderful character, so simple and transparent, and he would offer no other ideal to humanity as worthy of acceptance, for he says: "Follow me as I follow Christ."

We are not within the range of opinions, doubts, and theological controversies, while standing within that field of vision where

Christ is all and in all. Whatever differences may exist, or might, or could exist, in regard to the office, power, and influence of the Holy Spirit, certainly none can arise on the importance and necessity of copying the spirit of the man, Christ Jesus. Besides, whatever else any one may possess, if he does not possess the spirit of Jesus he does not possess the Holy Spirit; and whatever else he may not have, if he have the spirit of Christ he is the happy possessor of the Holy Spirit.

It is no difficult task, therefore, in the light of these premises, to solve many of the seemingly difficult problems of theology. These may be reduced to a sincere investigation of my own life, where conscience and consciousness serve me in the examination, and an unceasing examination of another life that was for me, the records of whose blessed history are ever before my eyes.

The Apostle in giving his reasons to the brethren at Ephesus, why he was confident they would not do this or that, said: "Ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus." The reason not only states the exalted standard of Christian excellence and perfection, but carries with it also the implication that they who have learned of Him will ever have the purest and holiest incentives to regulate their conduct by the life of the Great Teacher. Whoever has sat long enough at the feet of Jesus as to be able to determine how he would act under any given circumstances can have no higher ideal of becoming behaviour. A wondrous grace fills the whole course of the life of that man, and benevolence looks smilingly from his eyes, who had long lingered in the presence of Jesus to learn of him. He is not ugly in features or conduct from whose face and life Jesus looks and acts. That one is the most graceful being on this earth in whose heart Christ is the most surely formed "the hope of glory." The hollow conventionalities of the world, and all that men have written and put in books as rules of etiquette are cold indeed, without that benevolence which is the essence of all true politeness. "Politeness of manner," says Samuel Smiles, "is not worth much unless it is accompanied by polite actions. Grace may be but skin-deep—very pleasant and attractive, and yet very heartless. Honest courage is of greater worth than any amount of grace; purity is better than elegance; and cleanliness of body, mind and heart, than any amount of fine art. While the cultivation of the graces is not to be neglected, it should never

be forgotten that there is something far higher and nobler to be aimed at—greater than pleasure, greater than art, greater than wealth, greater than power, greater than intellect, greater than genius; and that is purity and excellence of character. Without a solid, sterling basis of individual goodness, all the grace, elegance, and art in the world would fail to save or to elevate a people."

The prayer of Moses, "Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us," should be the daily utterance of every heart, intensified by the fact that we now see that beauty in the face of Jesus Christ. We may, then, be changed into "the same image from glory to glory."

"That I may know Him." In view of the apparent fullness of the knowledge of Jesus, possessed by this Great Apostle to the Gentiles, it may seem strange that he should still be asking to "know Him." It is but the revelation from another's experience of that which we have realized so often in learning Jesus, that beyond the beautiful, simple and transparent record of His life there lies a world of meaning, that beneath the surface of facts there forever runs the undercurrent of divine philosophy, wisdom and love. There is not an incident of His life, however seemingly trivial it may appear, but is freighted with a precious meaning for our hearts to-day. If we will look, our observation will always be richly rewarded by the revelation of those principles of life and duty that must forever be the glory of humanity. Once he stood, at nightfall, a poor beggar at the gate of some little village of Samaria, asking the pitiful boon of a place where he might lay his head just for one night. The power of prejudice drove from the hearts of the villagers the principles of common decency and propriety, and him from their gates. Intolerance and retaliation called forth from the usually meek and gentle James and John the request made to Christ: "Wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Jesus says: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." Let not the religious proscription and intolerance that have existed since that day he laid to the charge of Christianity in view of Christ's reproof on this occasion, and his forbearance towards those full of prejudice and ignorance. Surrounded by this display of the weaknesses and frailties of human nature he wrote over the whole scene these gracious words: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," while the father caused to be written over this, the richest beggar

of the world, "Though he was rich yet for your sakes he became poor that ye through his poverty might be rich."

While counting all things else but refuse for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, there was a power that loosed the bands of death and opened the grave in which Jesus slept, and looking forward to this sleep and this awakening of Him whose life he would copy, and seeing in it all a promise and a prophecy of what he may and can be, Paul exclaims once more, "That I may know the power of his resurrection." While waiting for the dawning of that day when "he shall change our vile bodies, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," when in the adoption of the sons of God we shall be introduced into the glorious liberty of the children of God, Paul longs for that experimental knowledge of this transforming power, when, unlogged by clay, we shall see as we are seen in the presence of Him whose empty grave and resurrection have allayed the fears and inspired the hopes of humanity.

"THE FELLOWSHIP OF HIS SUFFERINGS."

"That I may know the fellowship of his sufferings." Looking away from the grave, and back upon life again, he views the highest peaks of that Highway of Holiness thrown up by Jesus and along which He himself was made perfect, as the Saviour of the World, and he prays for a fellowship, a holy partnership in his sufferings.

It may appear strange that out of so large an experience as was Paul's in those fearful sufferings of the body that were his, because he was Christ's, he should be heard praying, near the close of his eventful and suffering-life, that he might know the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ. Logic and reason compel us to look beyond the physical and the visible into another realm for the solution of this apparently inconsistent aspiration of Paul. None knew so well, or better than he, the fearful sufferings growing out of the offense of the cross. An active participation in the threatenings and curses that were breathed from the enemies of the cross had made him an unfeeling witness of the sufferings of others, while he has left the following graphic record of his own sufferings after that he became a follower of Christ: "In labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I

suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by my own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness."

Not only so, but he has written the happiest solution of these tears and griefs, and given the sweetest philosophy of the ministry of affliction in these words: "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." "Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them who are exercised thereby." He was walking too close to "The man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs," to Him "who was wounded for our transgressions and by whose stripes we are healed," for him to mean only, and no more, that he longed to be partaker with Jesus in the suffering of affliction and persecution. If this be the fellowship for which the Apostle prayed, I am at a loss to know how he could be so oblivious to the fullness of his present inheritance, nor can I see how we may enter into this fellowship under the benign influences of the peaceful reign of Jesus.

We have a glimpse, at least, of that field of thought suggested by the words of the Apostle in regard to "the fellowship of his sufferings," when at the close of that long list of physical sufferings, quoted above, he says: "Besides these things which are from *without*, that which comes upon me daily, the care of all the churches."

The familiar and touching prophecy of Isaiah was fulfilled in Jesus who bore the physical woes and wants of the people. Standing, as he did, in the midst of a selfish and an exclusive generation, one whose religiousness found expression in the prayer, "I thank God I am not as other men," and whose ear was deaf to the piteous appeals of the poor and needy, it is not strange that his keen sympathy with human sufferings has awakened the admiration of all, even of those who would rob him of his divinity, and whose vision extends no further than to the material and the temporal.

The multiplied forms of physical maladies, every conceivable want of the body, were brought before him, and never did he turn any empty away. The otherwise hopeless appeal of the leper, the

tender beseeching of the woman helpless in the midst of her infirmities, the cry of hunger, the senseless ravings of the demoniac, the inquiring look of the motionless paralytic, indeed all the varied phases of suffering to which flesh is heir, fell beneath his beneficent smile and fled before the philanthropy of his touch and of his look. The heavy and listless tread of the unfeeling multitude could not drown the cry of the blind man that sat by the road-side near Jericho. He heard the cry and gave him sight. He unstopped the ears of the deaf, and loosed the tongue of the dumb. Surely these burdens he daily bore were not light. They drew from his loving heart a sympathy that had in it a suffering peculiar to one who could feel for so many and in such a variety of ills.

It is no little grace of a Christian character to enter into the fellowship of his sufferings along the line of his life thus indicated. If death ends all, and this is the only life we can have, the aspiration of every heart, it appears to me, should be to share with Jesus this blessed sympathy with suffering humanity. This charity and philanthropy would brighten this world, and make sweeter that life from which they emanate, however short it might seem between the cradle and the grave.

We may pray to know in some degree, in the richness of Christian experience, that wonderful sympathy of Jesus that drew out of his great heart an ever ready response to those who were in need.

A touching illustration of this fellowship recently fell under my notice from the pen of Sister Shishmanian, the wife of our missionary at Constantinople. It is mentioned incidentally in her letter, yet there is a depth and a pathos of meaning in it that brought to my mind the Mighty Missionary from the skies and his work among men: "All classes are brought to our doors; some through curiosity, some through interest, and many from need of assistance. The many appeals we have from suffering ones, suffering from hunger and disease, is heart-rending, and doubly so, because we cannot supply the demand made upon us. I keep in convenient reach a few medicines, such as are required in ordinary calls, and Mother S. is skillful in healing wounds and sores. She has her box of salves and cloths, and is a great help to us."

This is the door through which Christ entered as he walked into the human heart. It must be the initial in all lands and among all people. It was not to afford him a theatre for the display of his

wondrous powers as the miracle-worker that he found humanity as he did. It was in no singular condition then, nor bound by any merely local necessities. The Great Physician is no longer among men to heal their wounds and to alleviate their woes, but having been taught of Him, and catching his spirit and entering into fellowship with his sufferings, his disciples stand in the world to throw the protecting Aegis of Christian charity over the sufferings and helplessness of humanity.

This is the platform upon which Jesus stood in order to reach up and beyond after the spirits of men. Upon this lower plane of man's being here, he found a firm and a sure footing that he might climb into the sacred precincts of the heart. Through the tangible, the visible, and the earthly, he would safely and lovingly lead us into a more wonderful fellowship, and into sufferings as far beyond as the spirit is superior to the body, Heaven to earth, and sin to sickness.

Between these extremes, however, there is another suffering of the Saviour that found its expression in a tear. "Jesus wept." He wept over human grief, and has sanctified forever that divine element of our holy religion, "weep with those that weep." In the presence of the tears of helpless orphanage, and beside the silent tomb, there was a suffering born of sympathy with human sorrow that pressed out a tear from the deep well of his affections. Looking away now from the diseases and afflictions of the flesh, and turning his eye from the sepulchre in which lies buried the body of Lazarus, he read in the human heart the sufferings of a pent-up sorrow and of a silent grief, and his own great heart is touched by these woes and griefs of men. That tear did not dry upon the cheek of Jesus, nor has it ever fallen from the thoughts of men, but trickling through the centuries, it has grown into a mighty stream bearing upon its bosom the love of God, softening and comforting hard and troubled hearts. By this and similar instances in the life of the tearful Saviour, we have been introduced into that large company of weeping ones, who are troubled, not because of physical pain nor want of the soul's peace with God, but their hearts have been broken, and sorrow broods over the darkness and desolation within. The Apostle Paul translated the tear of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus, and has given it to us in these words: "Remember them who are in bonds as bound with them, and them who suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body."

That which brought Jesus from the skies, that compassed the distance between the Throne and the Manger of Bethlehem, that exchanged the robes of Eternal Glory for the swaddling clothes of helpless infancy, that turned the song of joy to the feeble cry of the infant stranger, will introduce us to the greatest and holiest of all the sufferings of the Son of God. It is the climax of his sorrow, and within the circle of this grief, partaking of this suffering, man may find his nearest approach to the "man of sorrow," and secure the noblest achievements of his faith and love. The worth of the immortal spirit, and its hopeless alienation from God unless He became flesh and dwelt among men, were the inspiration of the gift of God and of the life that was given. Weighed in our own balances, and measured by our own standards of the valuable, Jesus said of the soul: "What will it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" This was said by accommodation, but He who said it stood there in the midst of his sorrowful and poverty-stricken life, God's best exponent of his valuation of the human soul. God has written its worth in the tears and the blood of his Son. He told it in the agonies of Gethsemane and the groans of Calvary. The infinite value and the eternal destiny of my soul were all wrapped up within that cry of Jesus: "O! Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!"

He stood once upon the eminence that overlooked the proud metropolis of his people, and wept. The Son of God is crying and the tears he now sheds are but the penumbra of the shadows of his greater suffering of Gethsemane and of the eclipse of Calvary. He wept over human guilt. The infinite yearnings of his heart after the souls of all men, began to be told, when concerning his own nation, he cried: "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! how often would I have gathered you together as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, but ye would not." But his love was unlimited. "God so loved the world." His universal philanthropy has broken through all barriers and all distinctions. It has run as a mighty, rushing river through the centuries, touching all shores, and visiting every clime. Its channel has been the deep places sin has made in the human heart. It issues from the Throne of God, finding its fullest flow at the cross of Calvary, and bears upon its bosom to the safe harbor of Eternal rest every trusting soul. The ultimate analysis of the sufferings of Christ will reveal in the crucible the wounds our transgressions have wrought, the bruises from our iniquities,

and the stripes by which our own wounds and bruises have been healed. The greatest grief of all must be that after he has filled the cup to its very brim, and mingled in it his own blood and bears it with his own hand to the dying sinner, he should despise the remedy of the Mighty Healer, and add to the ingratitude his own eternal and inenviable death in the very presence of Him who is "The Way, and the Truth, and the Life."

"My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved." "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." These utterances of Paul reveal the longings of his heart for the salvation of his own people. As the Apostle to the Gentiles, exclaiming as he traversed Asia Minor and portions of Europe: "I am debtor also to the Greek," there is an exhibition of the broadening of his sympathies, and a Christ-like extension of unselfish benevolence.

While he suffered in the deep yearnings of his loving heart for the redemption of Israel, he was rewarded with additional suffering by their malice and persecuting hate. As he looked to the regions beyond where were human beings sitting in the shadow of death, his spirit being stired within him as he suffered by this vision of a lost and ruined world, he was driven from city to city, and wherever he went bonds and imprisonments awaited him. Has he not become a partaker with Christ of those sufferings that bore most heavily upon His heart, and is he not bearing the cross, the ungrateful return from the objects of his affections and the recipients of his labor and love? Nevertheless, he felt too far removed from the fullness of that fellowship, and sought still a larger share of that divine love that would place a heavier burden of the world's sin upon his heart.

The Apostle Peter, in specifying the graces that adorn and distinguish a Christian life in the process of its development, very wisely consummated the whole with the grace of "universal love." This is the pinnacle of human greatness, because it is the climax of human goodness. Reaching this by the stepping stones of antecedent graces, we are brought into the closest fellowship with Him, who cried from out the gloom and agony of Calvary: "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

As a preacher of the Gospel of the Son of God I file an indictment against my heart in the court of the Everlasting love of

God. Of the counts I would make, this one would stand first and most prominent, that I do not love my fellowman enough. Let there be such an awakening of my spirit that my enkindled zeal will extend to the uttermost parts of the earth. Let not the piteous wail of human misery, entailed by human guilt, appeal to me in vain, whether coming from prince or beggar. The tear in the eye of every Christian, as he goes forth bearing precious seed, weeping, sparkles with a diamond-like brilliancy in the light of the approving smile of God. The tear of penitence upon the cheek of the returning prodigal is its twin sister, and both are jewels in the crown of our rejoicing.

"If we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him." This "Fellowship of the sufferings of Christ" will drive away from the heart every vestige of debasing selfishness; it will lead us into the open fields both at home and abroad for missionary work; it will press us forward to open the doors to heathen lands now closed to the Gospel of Christ; it will lead us and help us to remove the strata of sin and corruption that cover the soul that we may look again upon the image of God. There is a recompense of all this agony of our Gethsemane and Calvary. There is a joy that is set before us which enables us to endure the cross. We shall see after awhile of the travails of our souls and shall be satisfied. When the Son of God shall come again and visit the scenes of his sufferings, he will raise us into the fellowship of the joys of eternal life. While waiting for and hastening on to that coming and that deliverance, let us pray for a larger measure of his sufferings when "he bore our griefs and carried our sorrows," that we may reign with Him in glory with a larger share of the joys of the redeemed sons and daughters of God.

J. W. MOUNTJOY.

OUR BOOK TABLE.

LOOKING DOWN THE AGES FROM A PROPHETIC STANDPOINT, by John T. Walsh. Published by John Burns, St. Louis, Mo. pp. 260. From the Author.

This is a rare and exhaustive work of the subject of which it treats. As its title indicates, it is an attempt to expound the prophecies. Whether his expositions and conclusions are correct or not, there is no doubt of the Author's careful investigation and familiarity with his subject. It is refreshing and a cause of rejoicing to see our brethren coming before the public as Authors. We need a literature of our own. It has been slow in coming, but if it continues to be as well matured as this book, it will be lasting.

OUTLINE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, FRANCE AND GERMANY, by Miss Mary E. Kelley. Published by E. Claxton & Co., 930 Market Street, Philadelphia. Price \$1.50.

This book has been placed before us by the publishers. It seems well adapted to the purposes for which it was intended, as indicated by its title.

THE HEREAFTER OF SIN: WHAT IT WILL BE; WITH ANSWERS TO CERTAIN QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIONS, by Rev. John W. Haley, A. M. Published by Warren F. Draper; Andover, 1881.

Such is the title of a very interesting little book of 152 pages, laid upon our table by the publisher. The subject is particularly interesting to us, having had occasion several years ago to thoroughly investigate it. The author is very happy in his presentation of the reasonableness of future punishment; but when he comes to consider the nature of that punishment he suffers his imagination to outrun that which "is written for our edification." He is conclusive in his arguments showing that the Bible teaches the *endlessness* of future punishment.

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL. By Elder S. C. Adams, Salem, Oregon. From the Author. A neat pamphlet of 44 pp.

The object of the essay being to show the relation and contrasts of the Law of the Mosaic dispensation and the Gospel of Christ. It is well written and will well repay a careful reading.

GREEN'S "LIFE OF GARFIELD."—The Central Book Concern has arranged with Bro. F. M. Green to prepare a life of Pres. Garfield. Although a flood of lives of Garfield have been announced, this will occupy a vacant field. While it will give due attention to the public life of the deceased President, political and military, it will make a specialty of his religious and educational life. His relations to the Church of Christ, his work as a preacher, his church activities, etc., will be fully developed. Bro. Green was for several years a pupil of Bro. Garfield, was intimate with him during his whole life. The book will contain a steel engraving of the President and a large number of illustrations. It will contain over four hundred pages, and will be sold at \$1.50 per copy.

CENTRAL BOOK CONCERN,
Chicago and Cincinnati.

THE EVANGELIST—A Sixteen-page Weekly Religious Newspaper, devoted to the spread of Primitive Christianity. B. W. Johnson, Editor; B. J. Radford and S. Ely, Assistant Editors. **THE EVANGELIST**, now in its sixteenth year, is recognized as standing in the front rank of Christian periodicals. In newsiness, in adaptation to the wants of the people, in general interest it is acknowledged to have no superior. Its notes on "Current Events" are universally pronounced worth more than the cost of the paper. Price, \$2 per year in advance. Sample copies sent on application. Address, **THE EVANGELIST, Chicago, Ill.**

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER, a forty-eight column weekly religious and family journal. Conducted by Collin McKinney Wilmeth and Miss Lucy Rutherford. Associate editors, C. Kendrick, H. Drennan and J. M. Barnes. Price, two dollars a year. Address, **C. K. WILMETH, Dallas, Texas.**

THE CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY. We have received the prospectus of a proposed MONTHLY to bear the above title, from Elder J. B. Briney, Maysville, Ky. He proposes to commence the publication as soon as he receives the names of two thousand subscribers. If he does not commence before he receives this number, he never will commence. He has to risk his money and his time, and let the brethren *see* the magazine. He also proposes to pay *something* for each article contributed. This is absolutely impracticable. He will either pay a sum merely nominal or the value of the article. If he does the former, the pay will be no inducement to the brethren to write, but an expense to him; if he does the latter, he will never meet his expenses.

Bro. Briney can give us a good MONTHLY, and we gladly welcome all such publications, but he cannot on the terms proposed.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, published by R. A. Young, Nashville, Tennessee, (\$3.00 per annum), for October, 1881, has been received.

It is probably the largest Quarterly published in the United States, and is edited with much ability, being assisted by a large and able body of contributors. It fully represents the intelligence and culture of its church, and while its church is not responsible for its financial obligations or its utterances, yet it is considered a true exponent of its doctrines. It is said to be well sustained, as it should be, for it is creditable to the church it represents and will exert an immense power for it, as all well conducted Quarterlies will.

THE CHRISTIAN STANDARD, Isaac Errett, Editor, \$2.00 per year; "The Teacher's Mentor," 75 cts. per year. Standard Lesson Leaf, Standard Bible Lesson, "Sunday School Standard," and "Little Child," for the Sunday School.

180 Elm St., Cincinnati, O. STANDARD PUB. COMPANY.

THE OBSERVER; \$1.50 per annum. The official organ of the Bible Christian Church of America. Issued every Wednesday morning, from the office of publication, King street, Bowmanville, Ontario. H. J. Nott, Editor.

THE MISSOURI UNIVERSITY REVIEW. S. S. Laws, LL. D., Editor; D. R. McAnally, Jr., A. M., Managing Editor; B. F. Thomas, Ph. D., Associate Editor in Science; J. S. Blackwell, Ph. D., Associate Editor in Language.

At present, five numbers, of 64 pages each, will be published in each year, beginning in February, 1882, the numbers to be issued in February, April, June, October and December. The first number will be issued in February, 1882. The price of subscription to the REVIEW will be one dollar per year in advance, or twenty-five cents per number. All communications, of whatever nature, must be addressed to the

OFFICE OF MISSOURI UNIVERSITY REVIEW,
Columbia, Missouri.

THE NEW JERUSALEM MAGAZINE, published by the Massachusetts New-Church Union, 169 Fremont Street, Boston, (\$2.00 per annum,) for November, has been received, and contains several interesting articles.

C. C. CLINE & CO'S. PUBLICATIONS.

I. THE OLD-PATH GUIDE.—An eight page Religious Family Newspaper. F. G. Allen, Editor. Subscription price \$2.00 per annum.

II. PARENTS AND TEACHERS' MONTHLY.—A 24 page Magazine, printed on fine book paper, devoted to the interests of the Sunday-school Superintendents, Teachers, Scholars, and their parents. Only 50 cents a year, a little less than one cent a Sunday. C. C. Cline, editor.

III. GOOD WORDS, FOR BOYS AND GIRLS.—

IV. LITTLE PEARLS.—

V. THE LESSON GUIDE.—Prepared by Prof. J. W. McGarvey. An eight page monthly on the International Lessons, prepared for Scholars and Teachers. Terms: For one month—10 copies, to one address, 15 cents; 25 copies, 35 cents; 100 copies, \$1.10. For one year—10 copies to one address, \$1.25; 25 copies, \$3.00; 100 copies, \$10.00. Address,

C. C. CLINE & Co.,
Publishers and General Job Printers, No. 310 West Main St.,
Louisville, Ky.

THE CHRISTIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL SERIES.

A MOVE FORWARD.—The attention of Sunday-school Workers everywhere, is called to our Series of Papers for the year 1882, all of which will appear in new and beautiful type, and be otherwise greatly improved, supplying all departments of the School, and fully meeting every want. The Series comprises the following popular publications:

I. THE GOSPEL TEACHER.—The Gospel Teacher is a Monthly magazine of twenty-four double column pages, for the use of Teachers and Bible classes, containing hints on Sunday-school Management and Methods of Teaching, Home Studies and Work, Notes and News, together with a thorough exposition of the International Lessons.

Terms.—One copy one year, 50 cents. In clubs of five, 45 cts. each, clubs of ten and upwards, 40 cents each.

II. THE LITTLE SOWER.—

III. THE GOOD SEED.—

IV. THE SUNNY SIDE.—

V. THE GOSPEL LESSON LEAF.—The Gospel Lesson Leaf contains a full exposition of the International Lessons for the use of pupils, so arranged that each lesson is on a separate leaf.

Terms:—Per month, 25 copies, 30 cents; 50 copies, 55 cents; 100 copies, \$1.00. Per year, 10 copies, \$1.20; 25 copies, \$2.80; 50 copies, \$5.60; 100 copies, \$9.60.

THE CHRISTIAN, an eight page Religious Family Newspaper, J. H. Garrison and J. H. Smart, Editors. \$2.00 per annum.

CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,
707 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTELY REVIEW, edited by the Theological Faculty of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., for October, 1881, is received. Price \$2.00 per annum.

It is an interesting number and creditable to its editors and publishers.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, A Monthly Periodical, devoted to the restoration of Primitive Christianity, discussing largely the Scriptural *setting in order* of local churches with their Elders and Deacons.

W. L. BUTLER, Editor and Proprietor,
Mayfield, Ky.

THE leading article in the *North American Review* for January, contains the judgments of five of the most distinguished American authorities upon "The moral Responsibility of the Insane."

The announcement is made that the February number of the *Review*, to be issued January 15th, will contain Part III. of the "Christian Religion" series of articles, and that it is to be a very able defence of the Christian faith.

THE APOSTOLIC TIMES, Lexington, Ky. A weekly journal, published in the interests of the Christian Brotherhood. It is a large forty-eight column sheet, and is furnished subscribers, postage paid, at the low price of \$2 a year. Sample copies sent free.

B. H. COZINE,

Managing Editor and Proprietor.

THE BAPTIST REVIEW. Edited by J. R. Baumes, D. D., at No. 180 Elm Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. Price \$2.50 per annum. December number received.

The articles composing this number are worthy of perusal, being mostly on general subjects. It deserves a liberal patronage from the Baptists, and its appearance indicates that it is receiving it.

PACIFIC CHRISTIAN MESSENGER. Twelfth year. Eight pages, forty wide columns. Devoted to the cause of pure, primitive Christianity, Education, Temperance, Sunday School work and general news. The only Christian weekly published on the Pacific coast, \$2 per year in advance. Send for sample copy.

Address,

D. T. STANLEY, Monmouth, Oregon.

We could not arrange to have as much space as we desired in this number for Reviews. In the April number we will arrange differently. We requested the Publishers of our Periodicals to furnish us cards of their publications; some did and others did not. This will account for some being noticed more fully than others.

We desire to return our thanks to our brethren of the press for extensive favors shown us, in bringing our enterprise before the public. We are ready to show our gratitude by our works at any time.

MISSIONS.

SOUTHAMPTON, England: Established February, 1876, with two members. Present membership 134. Missionary, H. S. Earl.

COPENHAGEN, Denmark; and

FREDERIKSHALD, Norway: Established June 1876, with two members. Present membership 162. Missionary Dr. Holck.

PARIS, France: Established February, 1878, with two members. Present membership 50. Missionary Jules Delaunay.

CHESTER, England: Established March, 1878, with two members. Present membership 231. Missionary J. M. Van Horn.

LIVERPOOL, England: Established 1880, with one member. Present membership 50. Missionary W. H. C. Newington.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Turkey: Established September, 1878, with two members. Present membership 21. Missionary G. N. Shismanian.

KINGSTON, Jamaica: Present membership 200. In charge of Elder Tomlinson.

OBERLIN, Jamaica: Present membership 100. In charge of James Lilly.

DALLAS, Jamaica: Present membership 66. In charge of Elder Darby.

NOTE—If the proper persons would give us a correct catalogue of *Home Missions*, and correct the above, we would be much obliged.

PAPERS AND PERIODICALS.

NOTE. The following is a list of the papers—weekly and monthly—published in the interest of the Christian Church. The list includes those published in the United States and elsewhere, so far as the names could be obtained:

WEEKLIES.

NAMES.	EDITORS.	PLACE OF PUBLICATION.
Christian Standard,	Isaac Errett,	Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Christian,	J. H. Garrison,	J. H. Smart, St. Louis, Missouri.
The Evangelist,	B. W. Johnson,	B. J. Radford, Chicago, Illinois.
Christian Preacher,	C. M. Wilmeth,	Dallas, Texas.
The Gospel Advocate,	David Lipscomb,	Nashville, Tennessee.
Christian Messenger,	T. R. Burnett,	Bonham, Texas.
Apostolic Times,	J. W. Cox,	Lexington, Kentucky.
Pacific Christian Messenger,	T. F. Campbell,	Monmouth, Oregon.
Virginia Missionary,	P. S. Rhodes,	Gordonsville, Virginia.
American Christian Review,	J. F. Rowe,	Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Old Path Guide,	F. G. Allen,	Louisville, Kentucky.
The Christian Commonwealth,	W. T. Moore,	London, England.

MONTHLIES.

Christian Monitor,	Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin,	St. Louis, Missouri.
The Watch Tower,	J. L. Winfield,	New Berne, North Carolina.
Bible Index and Christian Sentinel,	H. McDiarmid,	Toronto, Canada.
Christian Worker,	R. B. Neal,	Louisville, Kentucky.
The Apostolic Church,	W. L. Butler,	Mayfield, Kentucky.
The Christian Foundation,	Aaron Walker,	Kokomo, Indiana.
The Christian Missionary,	R. Moffett,	F. M. Green, Cleveland, Ohio.
The Christian Telescope,	J. M. Ratcliffe,	Watkinsville, Georgia.
The Pacific Church News,	J. H. McCollough,	San Francisco, Cal.
The Disciple,	Thomas H. Blenus,	River John, N. S.
The Christian Advocate,	G. Y. Tickle,	Edinburgh, Scotland.
Australian Christian Advocate,	T. Smith,	Melbourne, Australia.

SEMI-MONTHLIES.

Ecclesiastical Observer,	David King,	Birmingham, England.
Christian at Work,	J. R. Farron,	W. A. Cooke, Bell's Depot, Tenn.

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS—MONTHLY.

The Teacher's Mentor,	Isaac Errett,	F. M. Green, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Christian Sunday School Teacher,	B. W. Johnson,	Chicago, Illinois.
Parents' and Teachers' Monthly,	C. C. Cline,	Louisville, Kentucky.
The Gospel Teacher,	J. H. Hardin,	St. Louis, Missouri.

WEEKLY.

Sunday School Standard,	—————,	Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Little Christian,	B. W. Johnson,	Chicago, Illinois.
The Little Sower,	W. W. Dowling,	St. Louis, Missouri.
Good Words,	C. C. Cline,	Louisville, Kentucky.
The Little Child,	—————,	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Little Pearls,	C. C. Cline,	Louisville, Kentucky.
The Sunny Side,	J. H. Hardin,	St. Louis, Missouri.
The Little Ones,	B. W. Johnson,	Chicago, Illinois.

THE REVIEW.

APRIL, 1882.

THE ATONEMENT.

The philosophy of the Atonement has for generations divided the best thinkers of the religious world into two classes; the first, led by Faustus Socinus in the beginning of the seventeenth century, holding that its influence was intended to be only manward, to create in him penitence for sin and such other moral dispositions as may render him fit to be forgiven, and, by implication, that God could have proclaimed pardon to the world without the death of Christ, had it been possible otherwise to develop the above named sentiments in us. The other class holds that the sufferings of the great sacrifice were intended primarily to meet the demands of justice Godward in such way as to make it possible to forgive sins without doing violence to "The righteousness of God."

The terms, Atonement and Reconciliation, coming from the same original, in this discussion will be used interchangeably, as also the words, Justice and Righteousness, for the same reason. A profusion of Greek words will not be thought necessary, nor will it be supposed that any more than the mere circumference of the great question involved can be touched. To save space in our few pages, it will be sufficient once for all, to acknowledge our obligations more or less to Bushnell, Young, Stone, Godet, Barnes, Meyer, Campbell, Dale, Grotius, Angus and a few others. Our aim is to find the ultimate principle involved in the Reconciliation and to show how the account between Justice and Mercy has been balanced.

The sermon on "Atonement" in the *Living Pulpit*, published in 1873, illustrates the doctrine of vicarious sufferings by supposing

that ten thousand British subjects had so rebelled against the lawful authorities as to require their expatriation to some lonely island for the term of ten years. Should any one of their number propose to suffer the exile for all the rest, he would be rejected, both because he had to suffer for his own sins, and also because there would not be sufficient public importance attached to his sacrifice. Should an innocent peasant, or even an innocent, influential citizen make the same proposition, he also must be rejected, because his suffering would not sufficiently express the government's hatred of the sin committed by all. But should the Prince of Wales offer to be banished for the ten years, out of pure sympathy for, and in place of, these his prospective subjects, the moral and political importance of his sacrifice would fully sustain the sanctity of the violated law and enable the government on proper subsequent conditions to pardon every penitent rebel without danger to the recently imperilled regal authority. Although the illustration may not represent the Atonement at every angle the following parallels we think may fairly be made out and we assume:—

1. That it is unnecessary to suppose that the Prince in his exile suffered as much, *quantitatively*, as all the rebels would have suffered had they all been banished—that he in person would have endured 10,000 times as much as would have fallen upon a single one of them. But in the eye of the law the dignity and rank of the sufferer would make up the difference in the number of sufferers. So the sacrifice of Jesus was *qualitative* rather than *quantitative*, and sufficient to justify God in forgiving the sins of the penitent without endangering the firmness of his throne.

2. The Prince, in our hypothesis, would not be considered one party and the English government, *of which he was a part*, another; he would not be *punished* like a criminal, for he and the authorities are supposed to be *alike* anxious to save those political sinners, and agreed together that out from among themselves this vast gift of love should be made in their behalf. No vulgar conception of criminal punishment could ever enter their minds while they were in deep sympathy with the sufferer, sending messengers daily to him in his loneliness and receiving daily messages from him; so all objections to the vicarious sufferings of Jesus on the ground that it involves a cruel, or vindictive, or criminal punishment of Jesus, are based upon a false conception of the whole scheme of love involved in the cross, for all heaven, “angels, au-

thorities and powers" were in the deepest sympathy with him while hanging on the tree. Such a notion of punishment has no place in a true conception of substitutional sufferings, Jesus "suffered the just for the unjust," but was not *punished* the just for the unjust. He *died* for us, but was not *punished* for us. "The chastisement, (not the punishment, παιδεία, not κόλασις,) of our peace was upon him," and yet he bore our sins in his own body on the tree," and "By his stripes we are healed." The whole God-head contributed those stripes.

3. It is unnecessary to assume that the Prince lost his own personal innocence and became actually guilty of their sins, but rather because he was innocent and because he was the *Prince*, he was able to satisfy the demands of the law and open the way for executive clemency. So Jesus did not become guilty of our sins when he "took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses," nor did he unconditionally "pay off our debts," but he lifted our bonds from the hands of Justice in such way that if we wish to be delivered through him, Justice is satisfied, but if not we are still to be responsible to Justice for our own sins. Our redemption is secured potentially in Jesus, but if we do not wish to settle our account in his mercy we must settle it in "judgment without mercy." Hence the rejection of mercy is the damnation of the soul—damnation on account of sins already committed and not on account of God's arbitrary justice—for "he that believeth not is condemned already." Salvation is potential in Jesus for all the world and practical for those who believe.

4. All heaven had decided from before the foundation of the world upon the "Unspeakable Gift," in support of the imperishable principle of Justice, and also that Mercy should find her appropriate sphere when that support was tendered on the Cross. Mercy never found such opportunity for the exercise of her powers before. In the nature of things Justice cannot yield even if it would, but in the nature of things Mercy always yields, gives, sacrifices, and makes up deficiencies. Mercy rejoiced against Judgment on Calvary, and Judgment was glad to have it so. Had there never been a sin in the universe, Mercy would have been compelled to sit idle forever, and Justice would never have seen a ripple upon the surface of creation; the disturbance of Justice or Righteousness alone could give Mercy anything to do. When the "Sun of Righteousness" or Justice shines in judgment, it hurts no one who is found

in the shadow of the cross; but its rays of judgment pass on to punish all sinners who will not accept the Cross. Justice must therefore fall either upon the merciful Cross or else upon the sinner who refuses Mercy. The spiritual equilibrium of the universe is therefore fully preserved, for while the claims of the law which is "holy, just and good," are fully met, Mercy is also triumphant as it hangs upon the tree and dies "the Just for the unjust;" so that justice and mercy each has its own way and fills its own place.

Jesus was at liberty to make an immeasurable gift to Justice to repair the dishonor done to it by sin, and Justice had a right to accept the *qualitative* equivalent and set the penitent sinner free from the curse of the law. As the cloud that followed Israel had a light side and a dark side, so the Cross looked Godward to face the frowning justice or righteousness of the law and also manward to offer mercy to all who believe in Jesus, who, as mediator between God and man, looked to the interests of both—justice toward one and Mercy toward the other.

5. Socinians object, that if Jesus in any sense paid our debt for us, then our obligation is merely transferred from one to another. If Jesus did not pay our debt he nevertheless became responsible to Justice for the sins of every one who believes on him and takes up the bonds of every obedient sinner—bonds he never expects us to pay except by a loving obedience to him forever—and if he is willing to hold them thus unpaid he has a right to do so, while we rejoice that our debt has been transferred from the hands of Justice and Judgment into the hands of a tender and merciful Savior, who will never ask us for the payment, unless we as apostates give up our faith in him and then our bonds go back into the hands of Justice to be settled. See Ezek. 33, where this truth is fully explained and enforced. Should those subjects of the Prince, after his return from exile, be rebellious and refuse to have him rule over them, instead of being benefitted by his sufferings, their former sins, increased and aggravated by this new sin of ingratitude, would all come back upon them and there would "remain no more sacrifice" for their sins. But we are now in debt to Jesus, not to Justice.

These five specifications show that the vicarious or substitutional theory is not only not responsible for the errors of quantitative sufferings and the other errors mentioned, but is entirely consistent with the deepest philosophy of good government.

These and other barnacles that have clogged the progress of truth being shoved off, our way is clear to a fuller understanding of the doctrine of the Atonement or Reconciliation, and we are now prepared to present our thesis in definite terms :

That in the sacrifice of the Cross, Mercy met the demands of Justice to such an extent that pardon might be granted to him who believes in Jesus ; and this we propose to confirm by a series of scriptural arguments, as follows :

1. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiatory," or mercy seat. Rom. 3:25. As Jesus is here called the "mercy seat" of the New Covenant, it is clear that his sacrifice like his type looks both Godward and manward. The High Priest first sprinkled blood upon the mercy seat and before it, *and then* followed the forgiveness of the people.

Blood first met the demands of a broken law and made it possible to forgive without danger to government. No government, human or divine, can afford to let sin pass unnoticed, and the blood of the spotless lamb was typical of that of "the Lamb of God." If the blood of Jesus, as the moral influence or Socinian theory teaches, was intended only to produce repentance in the sinner, the lesson should have been taught in the typical sacrifices, but was it? Was the blood sprinkled on the mercy seat primarily intended to produce repentance in the people or any other cognate moral sentiment? Was the sacrifice necessary to generate penitence, or did not men repent, then as now, from an inward sense of wrong without any thought, for the most part, of sacrifice of any kind? Did not David most bitterly repent of his great sin against Uriah without the aid of a bleeding lamb? Did he wait till he saw blood flow before he felt the moral dispositions that would make it proper to forgive him? No. He said himself in the fifty-first Psalm, "Thou desirest not sacrifice" for this sin, "else would I give it." Now, if the sprinkling of blood on and before the mercy seat was not mainly, as Socinians say, to develop penitence, it must have had an expiatory bearing, looking toward the demands of Justice, for these are but the two views of the Atonement advocated that are worthy of our attention here. A propitiatory or mercy seat has two components—the blood and the forgiveness, and the blood was necessary either for the generation of the proper moral dispositions in the sinner or for the satisfying the claims of Justice and we shall see still farther that the former is not true and therefore the latter must

be. Not only did the Jews ten thousand times repent of conscious wrong without the presence of a bleeding victim, but it was that sense of sin and repentance that for the most part made them resort to sacrifice. Moreover, John the Baptist preached, saying, "Repent ye, for (because) the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and not because of the death of any victim whatever. They were "baptized in Jordan confessing their sins" without the sight of one drop of blood of any kind. God "commands all men everywhere to repent because he has appointed" a day of judgment. (See Acts 17.) But according to Bushnell, Young and others, men cannot repent of their sins until they first believe in Jesus. The New Testament, however, does not make faith in Christ indispensable to "repentance toward God." Faith *in God* is indispensable to repentance toward God, but faith in the sacrifice of Jesus is not. Men may believe in God and repent toward God long before they hear of Jesus. They believed in God, repented toward God, and then came to Jesus by faith for the pardon of sins. "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel." Why then contend that a man must accept the great sacrifice to produce repentance if they had to "repent and then believe the gospel." To believe in God is one thing, to believe in Jesus is another. "Ye believe in God, believe *also* in me." John 14:1. These are very different propositions. Faith *in God* must come *before repentance toward God*, but who can prove that no one can repent of his sins until he believes on Jesus? How then can the main purpose of the Cross be to produce penitence in the sinner, if repentance was and still is very practicable without believing in the Cross? Such a view reduces the value of the crucifixion to a comparative trifle. Faustus Socinus, and all his followers since, have contended that the death of Jesus had no bearing toward God to meet any demand of Justice in favor of a broken law, but looked manward only in order that, seeing our sins rebuked by the sorrows of Calvary, we might become sorry enough for them to repent and be fit to be forgiven. But not only is faith in Christ unnecessary to repentance, but Jesus said "Publicans and harlots believed him, (John the Baptist), and ye, after ye had seen it, *repented not, that you might believe.*" Here, instead of faith being precedent to repentance, it is just the reverse, and if true faith in Christ implies *trust* in him as our personal Savior, can any man, who still loves his sins, believe with all his heart on the Son of God? He may believe in Christ merely as a true historical

character, but it is impossible for "the carnal man" to "believe with all the heart."

Now to finish the complete overthrow of the moral influence theory we have only to return to Rom. 3:25, and consider that the *ἱλαστήριον*, or mercy seat, was not ordained simply to secure a reformation of moral sentiments, but had direct bearing upon the expiation of sin. The heathen notion of appeasing their gods with sacrifices is altogether foreign to the Atonement, but who will say that some amends to Justice were not due either by the death of sinners or by that of the "Friend of sinners?" It was not the appeasing of God's wrath so much as the defense of righteousness.

2. Romans chapter 3, verses 25 and 26, shows how God sustained his own personal righteousness before men. The word righteousness in several previous verses refers to the blessing of righteousness as received by men—"unto all and upon all them that believe" but in these two verses it refers to God our subjective righteousness. Hence my second argument is that *Christ as a suffering Mercy Seat sustained and supported the righteousness, the Justice or Justness of God*. If so, the *ἱλαστήριον* had to do with justice. Its power was not spent in its manward effects and hence again the moral theory is erroneous. The facts that support this argument are these:—

a. Before the coming of Christ, God had for a long time "suffered all nations to walk in their own ways." Acts 14:16. "The times of this ignorance God winked at," Acts 17:30, and did not properly punish the wicked and seemed to be taking inadequate notice of sin, so that his reputation for righteousness was imperiled. To neglect the punishment of the wicked is as unjust as to punish the innocent and the seeming neglect of it required a demonstration (*ἑνδειξις*) to the contrary. So God set forth Jesus a propitiatory for a demonstration of his own righteousness "in passing by (*τὴν πᾶρεσιν*) the sins formerly committed." He had the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world in view all the time he was passing by their sins without punishing them. He was not "slack as some men count slackness" but was simply waiting for the "fulness of times" when he could set forth the sufferings of Christ as an Atonement and as a refutation of the charge of carelessness about sin. He well knew that all the Mercy in heaven had long before decided upon the Sacrifice of the Cross for these very sins in such way that there might then be a "redemption of the trans-

gressions under the first Testament." It never was his intention to let sin go unrebuked and unatoned for, which must be accomplished either by the sufferings of the sinner or of his friend, Jesus. He by one immeasurable gift of love put himself in the sinner's place to to such extent as to enable Justice to allow him to be pardoned and escape punishment. The settlement between man and the broken law is effected by Christ redeeming us from "the curse of the law" Gal. 3:13, by means of a stupendous donation to Justice on our behalf which is put to our credit as soon as we accept this Grace of Christ. Now if the *ἱλαστήριον*, is God's refutation of the potential charge against his subjective righteousness how could it have reference merely to the development of repentance and other moral dispositions in the sinner? Repentance does not balance the account with Justice. The thief does not settle his account in a court of Justice with penitential tears but if atonement could by any means be made for his sin he might be pardoned as a penitent through the power of a *ἱλαστήριον*. Hence the Mercy seat vindicates the Justness or righteousness of God by meeting the demands of his holy but violated law.

b. That the *ἱλαστήριον* had direct reference to the defense of Justice is manifest from Rom. 3:26, for not only had God's reputation for righteousness been imperilled by not punishing sinners in the past, but it was still farther damaged by the fact that he was now actually pardoning the rebels, thus postponing their punishment forever. But Paul teaches that Jesus was set forth not only for a demonstration (*ἐνδειξιν*) of God's righteousness in "the passing by of the sins formerly committed" but also "for a demonstration (*ἐνδειξιν*) of his righteousness *at this time* in justifying him who believes in Jesus." That is, the death of the Cross *in some way* justifies God in forgiving sin, for if it had in no way been atoned for it would have been unjust to pardon it. Whether we can ever fathom the divine philosophy of the Cross or not, it remains that had not Jesus died, God could neither have winked at the sins formerly committed, nor could he now forgive a solitary sin. So the notion of the Socinians must be instantly rejected by every sound theological thinker. Hence my second argument proves, *That Jesus on the Cross so met the demands of Justice by the moral worth of his sacrifice as to enable God righteously to issue pardon to all who penitently believe.* Hence the *ἱλαστήριον* looked both Godward and manward; was a place of Justice as well as

Mercy—blood first and then Mercy. According to the Moral influence theory God could have pardoned sin just as well without the Cross as with it, if the people could have repented without it; but we have already shown that repentance in all ages had been realized before the coming of Christ, that the sacrificial lambs were not precedent to repentance and that there are some men now and ever will be who will repent before they believe on the Cross. Men believe in God, break his law and repent toward God in millions of instances before they hear of Jesus. The main purpose of the Cross then was not to produce repentance and if there was no atonement for sin, no meeting the demands of Justice in it, what was the use of it? Nothing but a huge make-believe and a great noise about nothing.

That the question of Justice was involved in the sacrifice of Christ is manifest also because the broken commandment is "holy, just and good," and this *just* commandment could not be violated without offense to Justice. But when Jesus died, "the Just for the unjust" and had "redeemed us from the curse of the law," it became "*just* to forgive us our sins," and it would have been in a manner unjust not to forgive after we had accepted the terms of capitulation. Hence "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." 1 John 1:9, and yet Socinus failed to see that Justice and the authority of righteous law was at all considered on the Cross. Should a murderer be condemned to capital punishment, the deepest and most genuine sorrow of his heart would not justify the Government in pardoning his offense, for Justice demands his life. The law would be trampled upon, government despised and anarchy inaugurated. But were the whole government, including the injured family, anxious to save the sinner, supposed to be penitent, from more than temporal death and could a sacrifice be found among the heads of the government willing to suffer temporal death in his stead, the death of the substitute, if it did nothing else, would surely defend the sanctity of the law and convince all sinners that the authority of law must be maintained and that without a merciful Saviour they all must perish. The case is not parallel at all, unless we can imagine a human government as anxious to save a penitent convict as all heaven was to save us when they decided before the foundation of the world that Jesus would in due time die for the sins of the people. If the *thing supposed* is impossible, the *supposition is possible* and shows how a sacrifice looks both to the

support of legal authority and also to the pardon of the penitent. The supposed sacrifice would not be the payment of any *debt due* to the sinner but a matter of *mercy*, nor would it be the payment of any debt due the government from the sufferer, but an unspeakable gift to support the authorities while extending executive clemency to the culprit. If the government had no sympathy in common with the sufferer as to the redemption of the criminal and was determined to have stiff Justice take its way to the neck of the murderer and execute "judgment without mercy" the parallel would entirely fail. If a creditor will stiffly refuse to let a friend pay off the debt of the debtor and will stiffly demand that the debtor pay his own debts and refuse to recognize the principles of helpfulness in life—this will represent the kind of justice men think of when they say that it is unjust for the innocent to die for the guilty. To refuse an arrangement that would meet all the ends of government just as completely by the helpfulness of the sinner's Friend is to punish the guilty for the sake of punishing. When God so loved the world as to consent to the incarnation and death of Jesus he agreed to an adjustment between the broken law and the sinner based upon a Gift, consisting of the "Contribution of our Lord Jesus Christ who, though he was rich, for our sakes became poor," not to save us from temporal, but eternal death. In governmental affairs no man could agree to die and rise no more and that to save a criminal from mere temporal death, nor did Jesus do this, and when we remember that Jesus retired to the unseen world for only three days, and that to purchase millions from "so great a death," we can well understand how a sympathetic heaven could agree to satisfy the claims of Justice by the expedient of the Cross.

3. The substitutional or vicarious theory, cleared as above of its unnecessary and damaging speculative incumbrances, is further substantiated by the meaning of the word *Redemption*. The Greek nouns *λύτρον*, *λύτρωσις*, *ἀντίλυτρον*, *ἀπολύτρωσις* and the verbs *λυτρόω* and *ἀπολυτρόω*, as a family of words, mean so nearly the same thing as to require no separate discussion here. The fundamental thought in each one is that of a ransom or price paid to deliver one from bondage, captivity or death. This involves the thought of satisfying counter claims between opposite parties and the buying out of a real or supposed claim one holds against another. It also implies three parties—the captor, the captive and the purchaser. The claim may or may not be just, as

when pirates capture your son; if there was no other way of rescuing him, you would give a ransom for him. In case of the redemption of one who had sold himself, there were also three parties—the purchaser, the one selling himself and the one who pays a ransom to redeem him from the remaining years of servitude. This is simple substitution. Isaiah says: “Ye have sold yourselves for nought but ye shall be redeemed without money.” Isaiah 52:3. “I am carnal sold under sin.” Romans 7:19. Sold under sin as a master, for “to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey.” Hence, “the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom (λύτρον) for many.” In Numbers 35:31 we have the same word translated “satisfaction”—“Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of the murderer but he shall surely be put to death,” and as life was a satisfaction (λύτρον) the doctrine of substitution is unmistakable. Not that Jesus, as remarked above, became personally guilty of our sins, or suffered quantitatively, as much as all the pains of all sinners would have amounted to through eternity, nor that he was punished as a criminal, for nothing of this was true in the typical sacrifices, but the moral worth of his sacrifice was a sufficient “satisfaction” or “ransom” qualitatively to restore and preserve the dignity of the broken law. In Leviticus 25th and 27th chapters we are taught that if a man sold a piece of property on account of poverty it could be redeemed by paying “the price,” or if he sold himself and any friend or any one of his kin would redeem him from the remainder of his servitude, it was always done by the payment of a “price” “according to thy estimation,” and this fixes the original idea in the word “redemption.” “What things were written aforetime were written for our learning” and hence we understand the saying, “Ye are bought with a price,” 1 Cor. 6:20, and “Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold but (ye were redeemed) with the precious blood of Christ.” 1 Peter 1:18-19. “In Him we have redemption through His blood even the forgiveness of sins.” “Every firstling of an ass thou shall redeem with a lamb,” Ex. 13:13, which was “the price” of the redemption. We then have been “redeemed from all iniquity” with blood and not by virtue of our moral dispositions—blood first upon the Mercy Seat and then mercy. In Galatians 3:13 we have the Greek word ἀγοράζω which signifies to buy anything in the market for a price. “Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the

substitutional sufferings with Justice without ever rising to the plane of mercy in which Jesus moved, for he did not owe the sacrifice to justice any more than he owed it to man. He did not owe "his life a ransom for many," but he came "to give his life a ransom for many." Why could not Justice accept a gift? A gift to protect divine authority and also to save the sinner, is the philosophy that sounds the mysterious depths of the reconciliation and relieves us of all confusion as to any supposed criminal punishment of the substitute. The Father did not punish Jesus and yet he "was wounded for our transgressions and was bruised for our iniquities," and was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" but was "manifested in these last days" as the mercy seat for us. Our sins, which the Saviour calls "debts," have been transferred to him in whose hands they are never to be paid except by our love and gratitude forever. Justice is satisfied, the sinner is saved and "mercy rejoices against judgment." Jesus stands at the end of the infinite vista and closes up the work of the Atonement by sinking all the sins of his people in his fathomless liberality, and although we can never touch bottom in the ocean of his mercy we are sure that here the needle stands perpendicular and points unerringly to the ultimate principle in the doctrine of the Atonement.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

law being made a curse for us"—clearly *instead* of us, for "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The purchase was as fair and the price paid as real as any purchase ever made in the market places. If man was under the curse and Jesus became a curse to redeem us from that curse, it is plain enough that his death was not intended to produce certain sentiments in us, but was to reach a deeper want in the moral government of God. Purchases indicate claims and refer to questions of Justice, as when Paul says "Feed the church of the Lord which he hath *purchased* (περιποιέω) with his own blood." They had "sold themselves for nought" and were "sold under sin" when Jesus purchased them with his own blood. The same word ἀγοράζω occurs in Rev. 5:9 and 14:3-4, where they say "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." Though the words *Substitution* and *Vicarious Atonement* do not occur in the Bible, the doctrine is fully and most clearly taught in all the above and many other passages in both Old and New Testaments. *Αυτρώω, περιποιέω* and *ἀγοράζω* could never have been used by the Holy Spirit if he intended to teach Socinianism or any of its modifications. Like the cloud, that was darkness on one side and light on the other, the Atonement has two sides—justice toward God and mercy toward man. It was not effected at the expense of Justice but of Mercy. Justice was reimbursed by a sufficient donation of Mercy, but Mercy is fond of making gifts and is only then in her element. Mercy was as well pleased on the Cross as Justice was. That is, Justice and Mercy are both attributes of the Godhead as complement and supplement to each other and had no conflict on Calvary, for each had its own way and was satisfied. Mercy is the creditor and man the debtor. It was first law, then sin, condemnation and mercy, which is the ultimatum in the work of Atonement. Should scientists from all quarters of the Northern hemisphere with their needles approach the magnetic pole of the earth they would find their artificial magnets all dipping and pointing to the same spot—to a mysterious and inexplicable something underneath. So all scripture teaching, from every angle, points to Mercy as the ultimate philosophy at whose expense the Atonement was achieved. The equilibrium of divine government was disturbed by sin, but Mercy so honored "the righteousness of the law" as to enable it to let the guilty go free. If "The unspeakable Gift" was willing to balance the account with Justice and could afford it "What is that to thee?" Most writers keep trying to harmonize

Church of God is built on Christ and his teaching; not on the opinions or speculations of men; and were men as intent on learning the truth as contained in the word of God, as they are on the affairs of life, the faith of christendom would be more uniform, intelligent and firm.

The liberal spirit professed by protestant churches is commendable and modest. We know the old adage about persons living in frail abodes. When we are not thoroughly convinced that our faith and practice are impregnable, and are "charitable" enough to allow some truth to our opponents, modesty would suggest that we cultivate a liberal spirit toward those not of our communion. But if this liberal spirit render us indifferent to the truth we admit in others, and make us contented to live in our narrow shells, with truth and error, both in faith and practice, too nearly equally mixed, there will not be much prospect of the ideal of Christ, as respects his Church, being soon realized. The continued and persistent existence of denominations ignores what the Apostle has said as respects the oneness of the body of Christ, and positively turns a deaf ear to his prayer that his disciples might be one, and one, too, such as is the oneness between the father and himself. Christ well knew that his cause could not triumph in the world with his professed disciples divided into belligerent factions; and hence he prayed earnestly for their unity. There is, in the very nature of the case, but "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," and "one body," and we have as much right to multiply Lords and faiths, as baptisms and bodies.

It is claimed, however, by the denominations that their various church organizations are not divisions or multiplications of the body of Christ; but branches of the one original *Church*, and though separated, yet harmonious and fraternal; though belligerent, yet working to the same end; and though exclusive as to "the communion of the body and blood of Christ," yet believing that the excluded are Christians.

This view of the division of the body of Christ, a division that extends, in not a few cases, to the loss of identity with the church of God even in part, seems to have been intended to subserve the purpose of excusing divisions and avoiding its odium. The profession of a liberal spirit in the recognition of the character of other churches, when the practice does not accord with the profession, looks too much like an invention to cover faults and

THE PLANE OF SALVATION.

There is no question comparable in interest to the Salvation of the Soul, and none that receives so little attention and consideration at the hands of those chiefly interested; nor is there one of like importance about which men are more indifferent when professing to make it, formally or seriously, a matter of interest. The great mass of mankind, not excepting the cultivated, look on religion as a kind of prudential or respectable matter, to be embraced at some period of life, or given a respectful attention as they go along in life, deeply immersed in matters of the moment, or if of the future, a future of worldly honor or wealth. The numerous religious denominations appear to most men, even to those who are accustomed to *think* on other subjects, as so many different ways of attaining the same end, and as offering no choice beyond that of taste, social position or family association. That there is any truth or principle to be considered in determining one's ecclesiastical association, or any error so serious as to jeopardize our salvation, or affect our religious happiness, seems to be suggested to but few. The great majority are contented with what they have received by inheritance, or to follow accidents of association or the popular current. This is especially true of protestants, as they are not under the tyrannical sway of a bigoted priesthood, and as a class are restive under dictation. There is among them a greater and larger spirit of freedom when the mind asserts itself; but almost slavish when worldly considerations or personal interests are allowed to determine their church connection. The Roman Catholic is more consistent. He is taught from his childhood to think and believe that the Roman, or as he calls it, the Catholic Church, is the only church God has on earth, and hence he allows no other. He execrates all other so-called Christian Churches or peoples as heretical and certain of eternal condemnation. Were his faith as intelligent as it is firm and steady, it would be commendable. His faith in his Church is well nigh impregnable. Such should be the faith of the Christian in the Church of God, based on the knowledge derived from the word of God. The

errors which cannot be defended. A spirit of toleration is an inculcation of the Scriptures; but it has in them a limitation. An inspired apostle says: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; for many false prophets are gone out into the world," and "He that abideth not in the doctrine [teaching] of Christ, he hath not the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and have not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God-speed, is a partaker of his evil deeds." The liberality of the gospel has reference to persons, not to errors in faith and practice. The liberality of Protestantism covers errors in both, and particularly in the latter. There are some errors in faith which it does not tolerate, and very properly. Evangelical orthodoxy excludes Unitarianism and Universalism, the former because it rejects the divinity of Christ, and the latter, because it rejects his teaching, and thus far rejects him. When the Unitarian says that Christ is only a man—a very good and wise man, and a fit model for the world—when he says that he is not the Son of God, he is regarded as rejecting Christ, whatever respect he may have for him or how far he may receive his teaching. The Universalian is regarded as rejecting Christ, when he says all men will be saved, while Christ says that the wicked of this world shall be punished eternally in "the gehenna of fire." He also rejects the ordinances. Evangelical orthodoxy has pronounced these humanisms; and they are properly and scripturally excluded from the category of Christian churches.

The departures of the Romish Church from what evangelical orthodoxy regards as the Church of Christ, are so numerous and grave, and such corruptions of gospel faith and practice, that it thoroughly and heartily repudiates Romanism, and denounces it as pagan and blasphemous. The worship of saints, either directly or indirectly, is a pagan innovation, introduced from Greek and Roman hero-worship; and the installation of "the Virgin Mary," because she was the human mother of the *man* Christ Jesus, in a position mediate between the worshiper on earth and her son in heaven, to make intercession with her son, as though her maternal relation and influence over the son were carried to heaven, where such a relation is unknown, is certainly an act partaking very much of the nature of idol worship. All good protestants cordially unite in execrating popery, and in wishing it complete extinction. Its

corruptions are too numerous and destructive to regard it as coming within a correct definition of "Christian." Yet it is Christian as contrasted with paganism or Brahmanism or Mohammedanism. It believes and teaches the divinity of Christ, recognizes him as the son and apostle of God, and receives and keeps the ordinances as modified by its vicegerent of Christ. These modifications have gone to great extremes, but the Church claims that they have been made under the authority of a vicegerency, and are, hence, as authoritative as the originals. Protestantism repudiates this vicegerency and the authority claimed for it, and makes this assumption of authority one of the grounds on account of which it ostracizes Romanism. How far Protestantism is free from the like sin may be a question for consideration. The spirit of innovation and modification does not seem, as a matter of fact, to be confined to popery.

We have, then, in Romanism a religious body, formally christian, and holding the fundamental doctrine of the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures, recognizing the ordinances and the gospel as the power of God for salvation, holding to the divine institution of the Church and making it paramount, and yet, notwithstanding these characteristics, cordially and fully repudiated as "Christian" by Protestant Christians in general. We find, then, as a fact that a religious people professing the religion of Christ, and recognizing him as the Son of God, and as such divine, are nevertheless discarded by the whole Protestant world as "Christian." This fact shows that in the estimation of a large and intelligent portion of the Christian world, it is not enough to receive Christ as a divine being, believe in his teaching, receive the Scriptures as inspired by God, and keep the ordinances. All these things, necessary and Christian in themselves, are looked upon as being rendered wholly nugatory by errors in faith and corruptions in practice. This is an important fact, and shows that human reason and the enlightened conscience are not satisfied with a corrupted faith and practice.

For the last few decades there has been, and there still is, no little emphasis laid upon Christ and the religion he taught, covertly distinguishing it from the teaching of his apostles, as though the latter were inconsistent with the former. Just now there seems to be a great fondness with some to make the recognition of Christ as the great *moral* teacher the sum and substance of what they are

pleased to regard as the religion of humanity and capable of universality, alleging by word or implication that *apostolic* Christianity can never be received by an enlightened conscience. These men harp much on the wonderful teaching of the Christ, as thoroughly human and divine, presenting in his life and teaching the true character of God as an infinitely wise and benevolent being, utterly incapable of the feelings and sentiments which apostles ascribe to him; hence, all the religion these men want, or regard as worthy of the sanction of the human conscience, is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount. What is said in the Epistles makes the religion of Christ, if applied to it, sectarian, local and temporary. The Church, of which the apostles speak so much as a banded company of disciples, these would-be Christians regard as the badge of sectarianism, whose spirit is exclusive, narrow, and bigoted, and makes enemies of men where the Sermon on the Mount makes friends. These believers in Christ, therefore, reject and contemn the Church and all its appointments, as the machinery of priestcraft by which to alarm and enslave the minds of men. They profess to be very sincere believers in Christ, much better, indeed, than those that are found in the Church, holding more honorable views of God and refusing to believe that he is so malevolent as to doom any creature of his hands to eternal punishment. This doctrine is the Universalism of old, reconstructed by men of cultivated intellects and of respectable external morals.

These men have not been idle. They have spoken and written much, and the spirit of their gospel has been found tainting not a few pulpits. They have been opportunely aided by a spirit of freedom in religious inquiry and of revolt against the dictation of human authority once so prevalent in all Protestant churches. The religious world, through a general intellectual activity and advancement has grown away from Creeds and Confessions of Faith, and such like instruments of repression and oppression, and to-day we rarely hear them mentioned, and still more rarely of their being enforced. This spirit of freedom has crept into the Church from without, and men have come to enjoy freedom in the Church through its general prevalence in the State, which in turn has aroused it in the state. Thus has the spirit of freedom from prescriptive human authority in the Christian often found its way into the citizen, and from the citizen into the Christian. This ferment works into freedom in whatever mind it may find a lodgment.

This spirit of intolerance of prescriptive authority in the shape of formulas of Faith has been growing rapidly for the last half century, inspired, in no little degree in this country, at least, by our own Protest against all departures from, and corruptions of, the faith and practice of the religion of Christ, as left us by the apostles. The war we have waged against human prescriptive authority has brought the world a harvest of good. The denominations are all less intolerant and exclusive toward one another. They all realize that they have enough to do to keep alive their individual organizations and palliate their objectionable peculiarities. This has led them to seek some common ground on which to stand, and yet preserve their individual identity. Their Church peculiarities are pushed somewhat to the rear, while to the front is urged The Christ as the living embodiment of the faith which is to save the soul. Their creed consists of but one article, **THE CHRIST**, and it seems to be the hope, if he is made sufficiently prominent, that individual peculiarities will be overlooked or forgotten. Here is a common ground where all can meet in fellowship and fraternity and have minor differences obscured.

But this creed may be found, on seeking its meaning and extent, to be as indefinite as it is brief, and as ambiguous as it is comprehensive. The creed will not bear a close scrutiny, if intended as a means of uniting discordant sects. It seems intended only as a salve to an uneasy conscience, and not as a real or intended bond of union.

All this is apparent when we reflect how the thought is interpreted by each individual interest. The rationalist accepts it as his creed and the sum of his religion, the simple belief of which with a commonly good moral character, is enough to ensure him salvation in heaven, or rather, since this salvation is certain on general principles, to secure him the favor of heaven here. He does not believe in the appointments and ordinances of the Church, or in the necessity of the Church. These are but husks, useful, it may be, to those who cannot rise to the contemplation of truth and goodness and mercy, as these are manifested in the character and work of the Creator, but wholly useless in a religion that is to manifest itself in good works and intellectual and moral appreciation of the greatness and majesty of God.

It may not be amiss to inquire, how one can receive and honor Christ, and yet reject the Church which he has established and the

ordinances which he has ordained. Such a reception of Christ does not, and cannot, satisfy any of the ecclesiastical organizations of the day. We had as well repudiate his Atonement, as the Church and its ordinances; for all these are inseparably connected. The rationalist cannot be considered a Christian simply because he receives Christ with provisos and limitations not allowed by the Head of the Church. The Christian that recognizes the divine origin of the Church, and the necessity of its ordinances, cannot fellowship the rationalist as having any claim to be considered Christian, as this word is used or the thought expressed, in the New Testament Scriptures. It is thus seen that the thought expressed by the word, "Christ," is too ambiguous for it to be made common ground on which all may unite; ambiguous, not as the word is used in the New Testament Scriptures, but as used by the rationalist and some few professing Christians. So soon as parties begin to interpret the meaning of receiving Christ, their division begins; views are antagonistic and practices at variance. The separation is wide and the disagreement radical. There is nothing in common, either as respects faith or practice. Hence, there is no agreement as to what is meant by "The Christ," or what it embraces as essential to salvation.

The ambiguity does not wholly disappear when it is sought to make this a rallying centre for the union and coöperation of professing Christians. While there may be a pretty close agreement among most of the religious bodies in regard to the divinity of his being and mission, and the necessity and efficacy of his atonement; yet this agreement does not extend to his teaching and ordinances. On these subjects there is much difference of opinion and practice. The differences respecting opinions may be adjusted by holding the opinions in abeyance; but the differences in regard to practice can be adjusted only in accordance with the word of God. If obedience to the ordinances of Christ is to be regarded as embraced in the reception we are to give "The Christ," then all who fail in this obedience, cannot be regarded as accepting the dogma of "The Christ." Then again, there is a difference of opinion resulting in a difference of practice, regarding the value or extent of this obedience, some affirming one thing and some another, so that the differences regarding obedience keep the parties apart, though all professing to receive "The Christ."

Of late years this dogma has been taken up by some in our

own ranks, and treated pretty much in the same manner, and apparently with the same view or purpose, as by others. This subject has been so presented as to lead us to believe that the persons so speaking and writing were ready to fraternize and unite with all who accept the Christ by believing in the divinity of his person and mission. If such are really the views of those who thus speak and write, then we must regard all matters beyond or outside of this faith as things to be placed among the indifferent. This would be a total surrender of our plea. But if we are to regard this acceptance of the Christ, held up as the one essential thing, in the light of the Scriptures, then we must connect the faith in Christ with the obedience to Christ, and this obedience must be the obedience required by Christ, and not as considered by men.

The Church is established on Christ and in accordance with his truth; on him as he is presented to us by himself and his apostles, and not as men may otherwise conceive of him; and on his truth as this has been given us by the Holy Spirit through inspired men. We cannot receive Christ and reject his truth, in whole or in part, according as it may strike our reason or fancy. We cannot do this with human authority. Obedience is due to sovereignty, and that cannot be obedience to a sovereign which is dictated by a subject; nor can that be reception of a sovereign which is made as the subject determines, and not as the sovereign has directed. When we find one class of religious people acting on the principle that the will of the sovereign must rule and determine our faith and obedience in all things concerning which that sovereign has spoken, and another on this principle so modified by the human will, as to allow the subject a voice in the determination of any matter of faith or practice, there can be no union and coöperation between these two peoples without a sacrifice of principle in the one case or of human assumption in the other. Any other course than that pursued by the first will lead to the widest and wildest latitudinarianism, and consequently to the subversion or practical rejection of sovereign authority. It is the will and determination of Christ that all who profess to be his disciples, shall form themselves into a body known and recognized by him and the world as his church, and keep the ordinances and institutions as he directed through his apostles. No one can justly lay any claim to discipleship, or be believed when he declares his belief in the Christ, while at the same time disregarding his church and ordi-

nances. There can be no salvation attaching to such a professed faith as this.

A great many men seem to regard Salvation as a matter somewhat arbitrary, and hence under the will of God. Others, again, think that God, as the creator, is under obligations to save men in heaven, or at least, not to punish them for what they do in this life. So the rationalist seems to believe and reason; hence, God being under obligations to man to save him, because he is man's creator, the rationalist heeds not such things as the church and the ordinances. There are indeed some in the Church who do not think that salvation is wholly a matter of grace and mercy; and even among those who do so think, there are some who think that God is not bound by one absolutely essential and invariable plan or means through which to save man.

With such the Plane of Salvation has no well-defined limits, nor does there seem to be to such any absolutely necessary means to man's salvation, either on the part of God or of men. Possibly there is no view connected with religion more indefinite, or about which men think less, than the grounds on which the salvation of men is even possible with God. Yet there is no truth more definitely revealed than that he has a plan of salvation which is by no means arbitrary nor variable. If there be any truth in the word of God, nothing is more certain than the fact that no soul can be saved without the atonement, and this impossibility is with both God and man. The truth is distinctly and positively declared that there is no other means made known to man by which men can be saved, and no other by which God can be just while pardoning the guilty, than the atonement of Christ. It is, therefore, as certain as fact itself that no man can be saved who rejects the atonement of Christ, whatever else he may believe in respect of him, or however much he may profess to admire him, or in a manner obey him. Here, then, is where the Plane of Salvation first comes into view, standing high and isolated, and conspicuous to all the world. All who are not on this Plane will certainly be lost. There is no possible salvation for them. It is not in the power of God to save any who are not on this Plane. Here only is remission of sins to be had and enjoyed, and without remission, there is, and can be, no salvation.

But what is it to accept the Atonement of Christ? Is it simply believing the fact that Christ is the Atonement, receiving it as the

Scriptures contemplate and require? There is certainly no other name given under heaven by which man can be saved, but the name of Jesus; but how is this name made available to man for salvation? Certainly not by simply believing the fact, if the Scriptures be true. Men are required to do something more than merely believing intellectually the proposition that Christ is the atonement for sin. The Lord said to the Jews: "Except you repent, you shall all perish." Repentance, whatever this may be, is declared to be necessary to salvation. When we understand that it means a turning of the mind and heart of man to God, we can readily see how important repentance is in the sight of God. All, therefore, who do not turn away from their sins and give their hearts to God in repentance, cannot be considered as having come within the reach of the powers of the gospel, and hence cannot be regarded as on the Plane of Salvation.

More yet is necessary than the belief in the fact of his Atonement and in repentance as expressive of the soul's convictions and desires. The gospel, the apostle declares, is preached among all nations for obedience to Christ. Obedience is just as necessary and important as either faith or repentance, and must be rendered on these states of mind and heart. God has announced to the intelligent universe that every knee shall bow to the authority of Christ, and every heart bow before him in worship. This omitted, it is evident that faith and repentance avail man nothing in the matter of salvation.

The obedience of the sinner is rendered in baptism, and is there completed. Beyond baptism, all obedience of the believer is that of the disciple. There is no more baptism for the saint in order for the remission of sins. This obedience is for the sinner, and, as far as the Scriptures speak on the subject, is just as necessary to salvation from sin on the part of the sinner as faith in Christ and repentance toward God. The fact that faith and repentance are active states of the soul, and baptism a passive act of the body, does not aggrandize the former at the expense of the latter. *The disposition* to obedience, however necessary to the worth and efficacy of obedience, is of but little value or consideration, when not made known and confirmed by obedience. So faith and repentance, however valuable and necessary in themselves, (and their value can hardly be over-estimated), must be regarded as valueless while baptism is neglected. The Scriptures are clear and emphatic on this

subject. Its absolute necessity is apparent to all who understand the philosophy of its relation to faith and repentance, and its position in the remedial system. These three acts of an intelligent person are necessary to place him on the Plane of Salvation.

There can be no question as to the fact that obedience is necessary to the value and efficacy of the states of the mind and head which, in turn, give value to obedience. While this is the case, it must be understood that the obedience is that which was prescribed by the lawgivers and not some other which men may think will answer the same purpose. If the law prescribes wine as an element of the Eucharistic feast, it can hardly be safe and respectful to put in its place colored water, sweetened, and of like specific gravity. If the law has prescribed one form of baptism (to speak after the manner of men) it is an assumption of the divine prerogative to employ any other. Human authority allows no such privilege to the subjects of a state to alter, modify or amend its ordinances at will. When equivalents may be substituted, the law must state what these equivalents are, for no other party knows. If a court of Equity is permitted to regard and determine equivalents, the law-making power must establish such a court. Such a court for spiritual cases may sit in the heavens, and may in the end pass on equivalents or substitutes; but we have no advice of the existence of such a court, and it cannot be less than presumption to act on the assumption that there is. The only safe course, therefore, is to render obedience in the way prescribed. Any other course will obliterate all lines of distinction between the Church and the world, and oblige toleration of the most latitudinarian views and any mode of obedience men may prefer, and, indeed, no obedience at all.

These principles of action being true and correct, we can contemplate no other form of baptism than that practiced, and consequently taught, by the apostles, as lawful or permissible. Only immersion as the obedience of faith can place men on the Plane of Salvation. If men may change the form or the institution of obedience, they can do anything else they may wish, until the Gospel is shorn of all institutions and ordinances. The rationalistic believer in the Christ, with his moral life and without repentance or the church and its ordinances, may be an acceptable worshiper of God; and so may all of every shade of view and practice. God has erected but one Plane of Salvation, and this is clearly and distinctly described in the scriptures, and men have as much right to alter any part

of the Gospel, as they have to abolish the whole. No man with the scriptures in his hand and reverence for the word of God in his heart, and who desires to be saved, can say that he stands on the Plane of Salvation, when he has confessedly, omitted a part, or altered or modified an ordinance of the Gospel as ordained by the apostles under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit. No ground can, intelligently, be regarded as safe that differs from that stated in the New Testament scriptures.

Thus far we have considered what pertains to reaching the Plane of Salvation; there is much to be known and considered in regard to maintaining one's position on this plane. These are considerations for the Christian—for all who have entered on the life of Righteousness and Holiness; for the maintenance of one's position on this plane is equally important with that of attaining it. Many who passed the Red Sea, and witnessed the display of Divine power and Majesty at Mt. Sinai, perished in the wilderness; and so many who become members of the Church, or better, who become Christians in truth and fact, perish by the way, and fail of eternal life. There is no sadder sight than the loss of character and the position which it gives. Sin never appears so hideous, hateful and repulsive as when it robs the innocent of their virtue, and the pure and holy of their lovely and beautiful character. There is nothing so heart-breaking as the foul stain it puts on character, and the ruin it works on innocence. It has made a gehenna for the angels of heaven and has sent thousand of earth's angels to join their wretched company. The history of sin is a fearful one, and would furnish a salutary lesson to men if they would but read it. An escape from its dominion and consequences should be hailed with the greatest delight and the profoundest gratitude, and men will so hail the proffers of mercy, when they realize the dangers to which sin exposes the soul. That remission is granted the sinner on any terms should be esteemed by him the greatest mercy. Yet how seldom is the gospel so received! How reluctantly men seem to take each step, and how apparently indifferent to the question whether the step is right or wrong, whether by God or man decreed! Coming thus into the Church, it can not be a matter of surprise that there is but little appreciation of the work they have undertaken, or of the life the Lord expects and requires of them.

The life-work of the Christian is summed up by the apostle Peter in these words: "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of

our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ." As the sinner rises into this new life, and ascends the Plane of Salvation—the remission of sins—he meets these words of the apostle which tell him of the work before him. He has but entered a new sphere of life, has become a new being, and begun a new life, as he began that of his earthly life, and this new life must be maintained by the proper nourishment and care. He is but a babe in Christ, and may be a weak or a strong one, but still a babe with a long life before him, that is to be ended "in the fulness of the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus," in order that he may enter on the still higher Plane of eternal Salvation, to unite there with the angels in glorifying God and the Lamb forever and ever.

Knowledge is essential to the success of any life. As human beings, beginning life in absolute ignorance, we grow constantly in knowledge, and as we thus grow, we become correspondingly fitted for the walks of life whither our steps may be directed. So in spiritual life; knowledge is essential here. Though we walk by faith as having our eyes on the invisible; yet this faith is not one of ignorance. To know God and Jesus whom he sent into the world is life eternal, since this knowledge leads the soul to the fountain of eternal life. There can be no spiritual life without the knowledge of spiritual things. It may require but little to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved" from sin; but there can not be any growth in spiritual life without the daily use of spiritual food, which is the word of life. We may be ignorant of all other kinds of knowledge; yet if the word of God dwells richly in the mind, the spiritual stature of the man will be correspondingly developed. The Scriptures urge the absolute and imperative necessity of the knowledge of divine things to a growth in the Christian virtues, and our reason and consciousness attest the truth of the Scriptures in this particular. Spiritual life is not possible without divine knowledge, and even more so is spiritual growth and development. At the present time, the low grade of spiritual life in all communities is to be mostly ascribed to this cause. In all churches there is but little reading of the Scriptures by the members, and this little reading is but symptomatic of an indifference to things heavenly and divine, which is inimical to a growth in righteousness and holiness, and to a life of purity and love.

While knowledge is so absolutely necessary to spiritual life, a *sine qua non*, yet, great as it is, it is but a means to an end. The

apostle Paul says: "Though I have all knowledge and have not love, I am nothing." The culmination of spiritual life is found in love, in which the soul of man is brought into sympathy and spiritual union with God, and with all that is god-like, or characteristic of God. "Love is the fulfillment of the whole law;" the realization of the purposes of all the laws that God has ever given to men. It crowns all other virtues, and "hides a multitude of sins." It compensates for many shortcomings, and makes a life, otherwise defective, most pleasing to God. It is the foundation of the character that is to fit men for the abodes of bliss and love. It is the emotion of all the most god-like; that blesses humanity and would fill the world with joy and happiness; that banishes all evil feelings, and makes impossible all evil deeds. It is the only security that earth has against the ravages of sin; but for it the world would be a pandemonium. In connection with the atonement, it is the only power that God has to raise man from earth to heaven. Without it God is powerless to save men, and if Salvation were possible without it, it would not be desirable. The professing Christian that has not love in his heart, a love not for those who love him and honor him among men, but for those who do not love and honor him, has not attained to what Christ requires. The god-likeness of love is that which endures the contradiction of sinners as did Christ; that glows even under the arctic zone of indifference; and would bless, when ingratitude spurns and despises.

One can hardly claim to be in sympathy with Christ in whose heart love and gratitude do not constantly glow, as an expression of the appreciation which the heart feels for what Christ has done for its present and eternal happiness. The work that Christ has done for the soul is so wonderfully rich and great that a life of love and gratitude cannot be an adequate return for that work. However strong and deep they may become in the course of an ardent and faithful life, the soul, alive to its own worth and destiny, can never feel that it has made anything like an adequate return. Yet it realizes that this is all that it has to give, and mourns under its deep poverty, earnestly desiring that its love were a thousand fold deeper, and its life a thousand fold more devoted. The soul that does not thus feel in the presence of its atonement and Lord, should tremble lest God should look on it as not being in sympathy with Christ, and hence not on the Plane of Salvation.

The love which a redeemed soul has for Christ and God, is not

a new sentiment to be entertained as a matter of course, and professed as a matter of duty. It is not an admiration and acknowledgment of his unselfish and heroic love, a feeling of affection for one who was so unkindly and ungenerously treated; for one whose life and good works merited better treatment than Christ received, but an ardent, glowing, consuming love that feels, when life and being have been given to Christ, that these were but a poor return for a love so great, for blessings so precious, and for sufferings so unmerited, yet so patiently endured. The love which should ever glow in the Christian's heart, should dominate the whole being and life of man; should consecrate to him not simply a lively profession, but one in truth and fact, and with it, the whole man—"body, soul and spirit"—and all that man has. Ananias and Saphiras may now be found in the congregations of the Lord, and so may many others of like characters, who, in their abundance, have but a pittance for the Lord; but they are not among the saved on the Plane of Salvation.

Love is devotion; not a momentary, occasional, or periodic affection; but a continuous, persistent and unflagging love, that is ever ready to manifest and prove itself in whatever way, and by whatever means, gratitude may suggest. Such a love burned in the heart of Paul, and shone conspicuously in his life, and prompted him to endure every species of hardships, trials and sufferings for the Lord who died for him.

The love which is awakened in the soul of the Christian by the work and sufferings of Christ, continues to burn while memory feeds on these, and the heart feels their strength and force. His love is the living flame that keeps alive and active the heart that appreciates it. Its light is the proof to all the world that the man has been born again; that he has crucified "the old man with his deeds, and put on the new man" of righteousness and holiness. It is the one standard by which all are measured; the one criterion by which we are to judge whether a man has "passed from death unto life." It is self-deception for a man to think that he is a Christian simply because his relation to the church is indicative of it, or that he can be a Christian when his heart is almost, if not quite, a stranger to the love inspired by the gospel.

This love is positive; positive as respects Christ, his Church and his people, and also men in general. If we do not love Christ for what he has done for us; if we do not love his Church, so that

we will work and suffer for it, if need be; if we do not love his people as we love no other; and the world as he loved it, church membership will avail us nothing in the general account we shall give on the last day. The love we profess must be a living, positive love, not one of negations. It must be manifested in all that we say and do and think; in all our affections, attachments and loves. It must be to us the atmosphere of Christian life. It must pervade our entire being, moulding our thoughts and feelings and actions and words. It must so influence us in everything and in every way as to make our mind and disposition god-like. So important is this passion to the Christian life that one cannot be regarded as on the Plane of Salvation, who does not find his heart full of love toward God and Christ, and all good men, and does not compassionate the wayward and unruly as did the Lord.

Love is the fulfillment of the whole law. With the Atonement, it compensates for many a stumble and fall. It is the ground on which Christ becomes to us righteousness and life; for the faith that justifies, is the "faith that works by love and purifies the heart." It opens the door of the heart to God and Christ when they knock, and makes it a suitable place for their sojourn. It brings to the soul the anticipation of heaven, and gives it in advance a foretaste of its future home. It is eternal happiness begun on earth. With love filling the heart, heaven is secured; without it, impossible. It is the measure and sum of all Christian virtues, and has the power to aggrandize the smallest thing we do, and make up for much that we fail to do. It will atone for much, if not all, of our unwillful and unavoidable ignorance; excuse errors in thinking and believing when attending earnest efforts to know the truth; and give to an imperfect life a rational hope of eternal salvation. Without it, the soundest views avail nothing; the greatest human knowledge becomes a stronger ground of condemnation, and the charity that spends millions has no power to ingratiate us with God. What worth to God is the greatest knowledge of man; what to him the wealth of the world, since he has all knowledge and possesses all things? While it is our duty and happiness to know, and to grow continually in knowledge; yet this alone will not recommend us to God. Such a mind and intelligence cannot be found among men as many of the lost angels possess. The apostle Paul declares that the greatest knowledge without love is without profit to the individual. There are many who think

that the greatest glory men can render God is to study his works and word. But

"Richer by far is the heart's adoration,
And dearer to God are the prayers of the poor."

Not a few think that good works will secure the favor of God, and vainly imagine that liberal contributions to the Church will purchase a good degree in the time to come. This is a potent key in the hands of the Roman Catholic priesthood to open the treasury of many a godless man dying in his sins. Eagerly would the sin-harrowed soul then purchase eternal life with the treasures of time. But the same apostle again declares that one may give all his goods for the benefit of the poor, and not having love, is but a "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal."

There are many in the church who flatter themselves that they are Christians, who seem never to make a serious effort toward the cultivation of that spirit or mindedness which is declared to be so essential to the favor of God; for "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Here is to be found the great defect of Christian character at the present time, if not of all past time. In how few do we see the spirit of Christ manifested when the passions are aroused or provocations excite? Do we then show that Christ has any more control of us than when we made no pretence to discipleship? What Christian virtue do we now possess that we did not have before? What great change does the world see in us? In some, it is true, that Christianity shows but little change wrought in the outer life; but however pure the life that the world sees, the spirit may have thoughts and feelings, and the heart desires, that offend the spirit of Christ, as being out of harmony with it. Here lies the high Plane of Salvation. Toward it the weak and feeble in faith may work, and by assiduous work, attain. It extends from the simple child-like faith which is first expressed in baptism and its preliminary confession to that height where the gospel has produced its most perfect fruit, the unreserved consecration of the entire man to the will and service of Christ. We step up on this Plane in the faith of our baptism; the faith that pledges the consecration of the life to the service of God; and the disposition of mind and heart that grows and strengthens with time; that has no thought but that of obedience, and no aspiration higher than the truth of God, nor different from it. This disposition of heart and mind, called in the scriptures, "the spirit of

Christ," so essential in the beginning in order to the remission, is equally essential at every step in the progress of Christian life. It reproduces in that life the image of Christ, and affords the world a living example of the power and purpose of the gospel. Of such is the kingdom of heaven, and such will all men be when "the kingdoms of this world shall have become the Kingdom of the Lord and of his Anointed."

H. CHRISTOPHER.

WERE THE BIBLE AND ITS RELIGION PLAGIARIZED FROM OTHER RELIGIONS AND THEIR SACRED BOOKS, LEGENDS AND MYTHS?

ARTICLE SECOND.

In a former article, we discussed the general issue involved in this query. In this article we propose to examine a number of specific cases of plagiarism, that are charged on the Bible, by the sceptic. It is now constantly asserted that large portions of the Pentateuch, its history, laws and teachings, were plagiarized from other systems. In proof of this assertion it is urged that legends similar to its account of creation, of the events in Eden, of the events previous to the flood, and its account of the deluge are found in Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Persian, Grecian, Phœnician, Syrian, Assyrian and Arabian ancient mythology; and in the mythology of ancient Europe, Africa, America, and even the isles of the sea. We have already sufficiently exposed the fallacy of any charge of plagiarism based on this fact, which is fully admitted. Late research has shown that immediately after the deluge, there was an Accadian civilization in Southwestern Asia. Egyptian civilization, the Cushite civilization of Arabia, the Chaldean civilization of the Euphrates, the Phœnician civilization, the Pelagic in Southern Europe, the Persian, the Indian and Chinese, were off-shoots of this Accadian civilization. Traditions from before the flood, of the events of creation, as revealed in the "Hymn of Creation," or the first chapter of Genesis, which is probably the oldest revelation in existence; the events before the flood; the account of the flood; and subsequent events till the days of Abraham and; traditions of revelations given to Adam, Seth, Enoch, Noah and his sons, were present in this Accadian literature, and were also taken into the civilizations and literatures that were off-shoots from it. Research has discovered these traditions, and has translated them into our languages. The most wonderful are the traditions found in the ruins of Assyria and Babylonia; or the Chaldean versions of those

Accadian traditions, that have been translated by Smith, Rawlinson, Sayer and others. We are told by Stephen, that Moses was profoundly versed in all the learning of Egypt. There were two systems in Egypt—the popular system of polytheism and fetichism, believed by the mass of the people, and practiced for them by their priests, and the esoteric doctrine or philosophy of the priests and learned men, that Plato, Pythagoras and other Grecian philosophers learned, when they travelled in Egypt. This philosophy was based on the primitive religion of the Accadians, and of the antediluvian dispensation. It contained much of the traditions and teachings of the primitive monotheism, that God gave, by revelation, to all men. Moses learned this as member of the royal family, and of the priesthood, and as one of the philosophers or *litterati* of Egypt.

Moses spent forty years in Arabia. As son-in-law of the sheik, and active head of a tribe of caravan merchants, (for such the Midianites were), he had opportunities to visit centres of trade and thought, in Southwestern Asia, and became familiar with the philosophy and literature of the old civilizations based on the Accadian, and of learning the traditions and fragments of that civilization and literature then extant in Southwestern Asia. During this period he composed the book of Job. It shows his familiarity with the various philosophies and schools of thought then in existence. He collected, during this period, and during the forty years' journey in the wilderness, when he would naturally come in contact with learned men, travellers and traders, the materials for the book of Genesis. The traditions and history that were in existence, he collected, and united them into a consistent whole, and put the stamp of inspiration on such collection. The book of Genesis, as the difference in style, the different names given to the Deity, Elohim part of the time, and Jehovah or Jehovah Elohim part of the time, was made up by collecting, collating and uniting a number of older documents. The division into "books of generations" proves the same thing. But the work of Moses as compiler, is so incorporated into the work, and he has so blended the materials he used that no one can separate them. All this is freely conceded to be true, and it does not affect the fact that Moses was the author of Genesis, nor its truthfulness or inspiration one particle. It no more proves plagiarism than the use of previously existing materials by Bancroft, in his History of the United States, proves him to be a

plagiarist. It is asserted that the religion, the laws and the teachings of the Pentateuch were plagiarized from other systems. If the ones making such charges were agreed concerning the original owner of the stolen goods, and were consistent with themselves, in their statements, there would be more force in their assertions. One finds the original of the Pentateuch in China; another in India; another in Persia; another in Chaldea; another in Arabia; another in Egypt. Each is certain that his client owned the property he asserts was stolen by the author or authors of Pentateuch. "Well," say a certain party, "we *know* it was stolen from Egypt." If this means that it was copied from the popular superstition of Egypt, it is grossly absurd. Infidels tell us the religion of Pentateuch was very exclusive and hostile to other systems; and intolerant and persecuting. It punished all copying or imitating them with such severity, that they denounce it as barbarous. This was especially true of the superstition of Egypt. It was denounced with peculiar severity, and punished with peculiar sternness. Even the most trifling customs that had any connection with it, were specially and severely condemned and forbidden. All this is urged by Ingersoll and others, when denouncing the religion of Pentateuch as intolerant, exclusive, bigoted and inhuman. And in the next breath they will tell us that the religion of Pentateuch was all plagiarized from a system that they tell us it persecuted and legislated against—against its minutest feature, with such intolerant severity and jealousy. If there can be a contradiction, here is one. It is true that it legislated against the brutal animalism and impurity of Egyptian religion, with peculiar care and severity. It is as true that the charge that Moses plagiarized from the system he so severely condemned and excluded, is false and absurd. We have sufficiently explained the use he made of the philosophy of the priests. There had been revelations for thousands of years, when Moses compiled Genesis. There were traditions and fragments of these revelations in existence. God did not reveal to Moses, nor inspire Moses to reveal, what was already in existence. Moses collected and united in a consistent whole these revelations, and on them, he based his own revelations, that were a continuation and development of them.

In revealing a religion to man, God would not reveal what man already knew. He could not reveal through Moses what he had previously revealed. If a truth had been discovered by human

reason, Moses used it and gave to it divine sanction. Hebrew prophets did the same through all Hebrew history. So did their inspired writers. Solomon collected and set in order many proverbs of surrounding nations. Probably much the smaller portion of the book was original with him. It is urged that Jesus borrowed his system from the Essenes. The Essenes had given to the truths of the Old Testament the most correct development they had received previous to our Savior's ministry. The mission of Jesus was to continue and develop to perfection the revelation of the Old Testament. His teachings, of course, accorded with all the teachings of the Essenes, that were a correct development of Old Testament revelation. Jesus accepted and put his divine sanction on all fundamental religious truth then in existence. His apostles did the same. If Chinese, Indian, Persian, Egyptian, Grecian, or any other religion or philosophy had attained to a knowledge of fundamental moral or religious truths as a perfect system, Christianity would contain it and agree with it. Christianity appealed to it, used it, built on it, and developed and perfected it. Skepticism should use common sense and be willing to allow Jehovah and his inspired servants to use common sense, in giving revelation and religion to man; and allow them to use a truth or good thing already in existence, and not absurdly insist that they create it, when such creation would be impossible, for it was already in existence; or reveal or create something different, when, if different, it would be false and wrong, and would not answer the purpose.

It is asserted that much of the Bible and its religion was borrowed from India. This has been a favorite assertion of French infidels, from the time that Indian literature first attracted the attention of European scholars. It was suggested by the resemblance of certain portions of Hindoo mythology, and certain Vedic hymns, to portions of the Bible. We have already explained the common origin of these fragments of Indian literature and of the Bible, in primitive monotheism. When the Portuguese, who were the first Europeans to begin commercial intercourse with India, and to establish trading posts and colonies in India, began to visit India, they found Christians who traced their origin to Thomas the Apostle, and who had Christian literature of very ancient date. They found Israelites who had been in India for 1800 years, or since 400 years before Christ, who had a very ancient Hebrew lit-

erature in their possession. The Portuguese established missions and attempted to convert the Hindoos. The Hindoo pandits or learned men were ready to contend for the superiority of their religion, and the monks had much controversy with them. A Portuguese monk wrote a dialogue in Sanscrit to demonstrate to the Hindoos the excellence of the morality of Christianity. It was a statement of Christian morals, and to avoid rousing prejudice, all reference to Christianity by name or as a religion was avoided. About one hundred years afterward some Hindoo priests, in a controversy with some Europeans, brought out this work as one of their old books, and as evidence that their system had all the excellence of Christianity. Voltaire got hold of it and Europe rang with the exultations of infidels. Here was the origin of Christianity. Indian priests had produced as good a system as Christianity. The Portuguese of God came forward with the original work and MS. and exposed the fraud and that infidel bubble was exploded.

Infidels have for years published a work, written by Jocoliatt, "The Bible from India." The author held some petty office in India. He was full of the idea that the Bible was borrowed from India, and that Indian systems were equal to Christianity, and in some respects superior. He began a course of inquiries of Hindoo priests and learned men, to obtain proof of his preconceived opinions. These Hindoos were unwilling to own, of course, that their religion was not as old as that of the Bible and was not superior to it. They were as ready as the infidel inquirer to claim that any good thing in Christianity was in their religion, before it was in Christianity—that their religion was older than Christianity and superior to it. Then Jocoliatt asked if certain things in Christianity were also in their religion; they would assure him that they were, and the next day, or soon after, they would bring Sanscrit leaves to him, containing what he wanted. They had manufactured it for the occasion. One of these forgeries is the story that Jacoliatt calls the Hindoo story of Adam and Eve, over which Ingersoll makes such ado in his lectures. Müller, Whitney, and our best Orientalists declare it is not in a Hindoo book or fragment that is more than one hundred years old. Whitney declares that Jocoliatt is grossly ignorant of Sanscrit and Hindoo literature, and was the victim of his own gullibility, and the craft of Hindoo priests. Müller is as emphatic in his condemnation. Underwood, in con-

nection with the writer, said Jocoliatt's book was unreliable and no authority. All intelligent infidels are compelled to admit the same thing. Yet infidel publishing houses publish it. Infidel papers advertise it. Infidel book-sellers sell it, and infidel writers and speakers quote it as undoubted authority.

It would be amusing, if it were not so idiotically silly, to read in infidel papers statements that Kersey Graves, who has not a common school education, who cannot write a decently spelled and punctuated sentence of English, who cannot even correctly use capitals, or speak grammatically—that this charlatan, whose books are a re-hash of the vagaries of Taylor Higgins and Du Puis, with fictions and falsehoods of his own, has exposed the ignorance of Müller and Whitney, and proved that these great Orientalists, the standards of the literary world, are charlatans! It is enough to convulse all the dunces of the universe with "inextinguishable laughter."

Infidels have been publishing for years the "Diegeres," "Syn-tagma," and the "Astro-Theological Lectures" of Robert Taylor, the "Anacalypsis" of Higgins, the similar works of Du Puis and others. These works were written when knowledge of Oriental literature was very imperfect, and when books and all that was said on the topic, were full of errors, falsehoods of priests of these systems, of falsehoods and misrepresentations of sceptical investigators, and of absurd speculations and theories. These authors used everything that they could torture into their use, exaggerated it, invented fictions, and on such a basis built theories and speculations, and made assertions that even such a basis would not sustain. The foundation of these works has been destroyed, their falsehood and absurdity exposed, and intelligent infidels have acknowledged their worthlessness, and have even assailed and exposed them; yet every infidel paper, book-store, and publishing house, is still engaged in advertising and scattering them. Infidels quote them and appeal to them, and infidel lecturers will re hash them to their ignorant audiences. Kersey Graves and other charlatans of his class, will re-hash these exploded books, and exaggerate their absurdities and falsehoods, and add others of their own, and infidel papers and book houses will publish and sell these exaggerations of what was falsehood from the beginning. This is infidel scholarship, at least the scholarship of nearly every lecturer and writer, every paper and book among them. This is infidel honesty and

desire for truth. It is in such books as these that we find charges of plagiarism and such wonderful proofs of it.

Perhaps the most noted charge of borrowing is the charge that the New Testament story of the incarnation of Jehovah, as the Christ, in Jesus of Nazareth, is borrowed from the Indian story of the incarnation of Brahm as Krishna. Let us first expose an infidel trick in changing the spelling of the name. I can remember when it was spelled Krishnu, or Krishnoo. Then it was changed to Krishna, which is correct. Next Chrishna; then Christna. Soon it will be Christ. It is a contemptible trick to sustain the charge of borrowing, by changing the spelling of the Indian name into that of the Greek. In the first place, the resemblances between the two stories, as a late writer in an infidel paper shows, are not so many or remarkable as have been claimed. Many have been manufactured, and some of the most remarkable resemblances that the infidel urges as proofs of borrowing are palpable fictions. The resemblances do not prove borrowing. As we remarked in our former article, there are far more resemblances, and far more wonderful resemblances, between the career of a Mexican king, who reigned 600 years after Christ, and David, who reigned 800 years before Christ, than in these stories, as the infidel states them, with all the resemblances he has manufactured. Yet we know that the Mexicans did not borrow from the Israelites. But we have in the Hindoo book, containing the story of Krishna, the means of exploding the entire charge. It contains the horoscope of Krishna, stating the position of the stars at his birth. Astronomy declares that the stars were in that position 606 after Christ, and never were before. Hindoo astronomical observations go back no farther than A. D. 1200. Back of that date they borrow the Arabian tables. These go back no further than 606. The Hindoo Krishna story cannot be older than 606 years after Christ. It is probably not as old as 1200 years. Everything connected with it goes to show that Hindoos plagiarized the story of Krishna, or the present version, the one that infidels quote, later than the year A. D. 1200, from the New Testament. To give it the greatest antiquity they could, they gave his horoscope the date of 606, the oldest observation they had stolen from the Arabs. We know that Christian Bishops from India attended councils as early as A. D. 300, or three hundred years before the horoscope of Krishna. We know that Christianity was in India in the second century, and

probably in the first, or at least five hundred years before the horoscope of Krishna. Hindoo priests, finding that the story of Jesus was taking their followers from them, revamped the story of Krishna, if they did not manufacture it after the introduction of Christianity, to retain their followers by making their religion like the one that was likely to subvert it.

We are told that the incarnation of Jesus was borrowed from the incarnation of Gautama as the Buddha. Gautama did not claim to be an incarnation. He did not teach the dogma of incarnation. His system, as he taught it, was really atheistic, and there was no deity in it to become incarnate. His followers have made a religion of his system, and made a god of Gautama, and an incarnation of him as Buddha. We know not when this was done. No one can prove that it was done before the time of Jesus. There is reason to believe that it was done hundreds of years after the days of Gautama, in the days when Buddhism became a missionary religion, and sent out its missionaries and made such multitudes of converts. There is reason to believe that the incarnation of Gautama and the idea of preaching the gospel of Buddhism were borrowed from Christianity, when the missionaries of Christianity came in contact with Buddhism, in the first and second centuries. The priests of Buddhism remodeled their religion, plagiarized from Christianity, and imitated the missionary work of Christianity. They did this to retain their followers, and to add to them, as they saw Christianity was adding to its converts. Right here let me say that the works of Edwin Arnold, and Johnson, and such men are not fair representatives of Buddhism. They ignore and cover up its errors and monstrosities. They cull out its excellences. They enlarge and round out these by re-vamping them and making them resemble Christianity. They even interpolate ideas borrowed from Christianity. Such works are practically very deluding, even if their authors did not intend them to be so. Take Buddhism as described in its own books, and as it is in reality, and it is no more like their picture of it, than the toothless, wrinkled, bald, skinny hag is like the padded, painted figure, in the ball room, with her false teeth and hair.

We are told that there is such wonderful resemblance between the ritual and other features of Lamaism in Thibet, and Roman Catholicism, that it is evident that Roman Catholicism was borrowed from Lamaism. Again, we have to reject the exaggera-

Israelites and their books. There is far more reason for such an assumption than that Hebrews or Christians borrowed from India.

We know that during their entire history, the Israelites and Christians have been surrounded by, and formed a part of the peoples and nations whose history are known. We can trace the history of Christianity and Mosaism back to their origin, and tell their condition in each generation, from their origin till the present. We know that the ancients knew but little of China, Japan and India. Their ideas were vague, and almost invariably incorrect and absurd. Europeans began to obtain knowledge of these countries about A. D. 1400. For over three hundred years, European ideas of these countries were largely mixed with gross errors. Their knowledge can not be said to be over tolerably accurate for more than one hundred years. Indeed we are now continually correcting errors, and learning how uncertain is our knowledge of Oriental systems, especial the date of the origin of portions of their literature and systems and institutions. Their religious literatures and institutions grew up isolated from the world of correct reliable history. They were concealed from the rest of the world by the jealousy of the Orientals. Even now, the Europeans do not know the names of the rulers of China, and did not know the real names of cities and provinces for hundreds of years. Then religion was concealed from the mass of their own people by the priests. Their records are exceedingly unreliable, and so are the assertions of their literatures, and religions, and their priests and learned men. In their present form things of recent origin are mingled with things of remote antiquity and the age of the oldest portions claimed for the whole system.

Then preists and learned men are exceedingly dishonest and unreliable, and have been so for thousands of years. When rival systems were about to make inroads into the ranks of their adherents, they would deliberately copy the features of such rival systems, remodel their own, and then claim that such features were original with their system, and existed in it, before the existence of the systems from which they state them. A work of this kind is being done in Japan now. Christianity is overturning Buddhism. Buddhist preists have revamped their system, and have incorporated into it the teachings of Christianity, and tell their followers that such were the teachings of Amita Buddha, thousands of years ago, and they tell them they are preaching a return to the original

tions of the skeptic, in regard to resemblances. The resemblances are not near as many, nor as great as skeptics claim. Some of these are such resemblances as are found in all religions. Religions, like all human systems, have some features that are found in all. The ritual of Catholicism is not the ritual of Christianity of the New Testament. So if these resemblances were as great and as many as the Infidel claims, it would not prove that Christianity plagiarized from Lamaism. But why not the ritual of Lamaism plagiarized from Catholicism? Why not Oriental systems plagiarized from Christianity? Christianity originated in the Roman Empire, in a period of which we have very full and complete historic records. It was approved and described by hostile systems, that surrounded it. The origin of Christianity was in the midst of a people who were learned and critical, and had been for hundreds of years before its origin, and were for hundreds of years afterwards. Its acute and learned enemies would have known of such borrowing, and would not have been slow to set to one side the claims of Christianity to be a revelation—a claim they were hotly contesting, by such an unanswerable argument as the charge that it was plagiarized from systems it denounced as idolatrous and as impostures. We can trace, in undeniable history, the sacred books and practices of Christianity, back to the beginning of the second century. We know that it was introduced into India before the close of the second century, and doubtless in the first. Its sacred books were in India before the close of the second century. Government records of the province of Shensi in China, prove that Christianity was in the province in A. D. 636, and was sanctioned by government in A. D. 639. A tablet of the date A. D. 731 states these facts. Latin records and inscriptions prove that it was in other provinces before A. D. 1100. It was in Japan before A. D. 1400. It became so powerful that it was only driven out after a terrible civil struggle and commotion. We know that the Israelites have been scattered, with their sacred books in their hands, over the Eastern world, since 1800 years before Christ. The Assyrian Kings sent them into the extreme eastern borders of their empire. They had synagogues in many lands of the East, before the origin of Buddhism. As it is known that Mohammed borrowed from Hebrew and Christian sacred books, so there is no reason to believe that Guatemala, in the many years' travel, in which he visited so many lands, his followers tell us, came in contact with

conflict, the resemblances disappear, and scarcely exist in lands remote from the influence of such conflict. With these facts in our possession, which system plagiarized? No historic proof can be given of a single instance of plagiarism by Christianity. Such charges are the boldest misrepresentations. We have cited many historic cases, notorious instances, of plagiarism from Christianity, by Indian systems. No opportunities for plagiarism by Christians can be found. We have clearly established every facility for plagiarism by Indian systems. Did Christians borrow from systems, of which Christians in Christian lands were ignorant, and that never invaded their lands and availed their system? Or did Indians plagiarize from a system that invaded their land, and that was threatening to overturn their systems? When Catholicism invaded Buddhistic lands, and endangered Buddhism, Buddhist priests plagiarized from Catholicism, as they are now plagiarizing from Protestantism in Japan. We have reason to believe that they did the same in the first and second centuries, when the apostolic missionaries invaded India, and endangered their system. We can prove that Christianity was what it is now, before it entered those countries. It can not be proved that Buddhism was what it is now before such conflict. It can be proved that Israelites were scattered into the far East long before the date of Gautama. There is reason to believe that their sacred books furnished him his basis and originated his system, as they furnished to Mohammed the basis of his system, and originated his movement.

How do Infidels know that the systems of China were what they are now 1200 or 1300 years ago, or before the introduction of Christianity into China? That their systems are now what they were in the days of their founders? That they have not borrowed from Christianity? Christianity was in China 1300 years ago. How does the Infidel know that it did not change Chinese systems? If he appeals to Chinese literature, it is an appeal to the one who would be the thief, to prove that there was no theft. There is no disinterested testimony to be cited. Chinese literature was all destroyed once, and reproduced from memory. Why not Confucius and Chinese teachers borrow from Christianity 1300 years ago, and over 100 years before we have any correct ideas of Chinese systems? Why does the Infidel swallow every assertion and claim of Oriental systems, destitute as they are of all proof? Why does he when he thinks he finds resemblances and plagiarisms, invaria-

teachings of Buddha. It will not be ten years till some Jocolliatt will swallow this forgery, and we will have another version of the plagiarism of the Bible from the East. In this way have originated the foundation and the theories on which these changes of plagiarism are based. We see such plagiarism going on before us now, in Japan. We have shown how they stole the book of the Portuguese Monk. We have shown how they stole their astronomical tables from the Arabs, then manufactured a lot of crude stuff to cover the period before 606, the date of the first Arabian astronomical observations, and then impudently claimed that the Arabs stole from them. We have shown how they stole the story of Krieshna. Also, how they forged the story of Adam and Eve, and deceived such gullible inquirers as Jocolliatt. Their statements in regard to the date of the origin of their institutions and literature are utterly unreliable, and we have no cotemporaneous reliable history, interlocking with their history to correct such statements. Their statements concerning the condition of their institutions and literature at certain dates are unreliable, and we have no means of convicting them. The contradictory conclusions, statements, and theories of the best Orientalists, the continual shifting and changing of theories and statements, shows how unreliable are the data on which infidels base their assertions.

We know that Christian missionaries and books were in India, and in conflict with the systems of India, in the second and third centuries. We know that Indian systems were not in Christian lands, in conflict with Christianity in those centuries. Nor were they before that time; nor have they been since. We know that Christianity was in China in the sixth century. We know that Catholic missionaries were in China, Thibet and Japan, from the year 636 at least, till the year 1500 and later, and in conflict with Buddhism. We know that Buddhists were never in Catholic countries, and in conflict with Catholicism. We know that Christianity was what it is now, before its conflicts with Buddhism. We do not know that Buddhism, or any Oriental system, was what it is now, before contact with Christianity. We know that Catholicism was what it is now before contact with Buddhism. We do not know that the ritual of Buddhism, or Samonism in Thibet, was what it is now, before its conflict with Catholicism, in Thibet. Indeed, we know it was not, for it is only where there was such conflict that there are such resemblances, and as we pass away from the influence of such

bly charge Christianity with plagairism in the face of all probability? Judge Hurlbut, in a lecture before an Infidel League, in *Science Hall*, so called, spoke of the resemblances of Aztec systems to Catholicism, noticed by Catholic preists when they entered Mexico. The Catholic priests said that the devil had stolen from the true religion, and fabricated the Mexican idolatry. As absurd as such a theory was, it was divine wisdom, when compared with his assumption. He assumed that the Israelitish, Christian and Catholic systems had borrowed from the Mexican system. Infidels have plagiarism on the brain, to such an extent that a professed Scientific Infidel, in a lecture in *Science Hall*, could venture such a preposterous assertion. According to this *Scientific* theory, mankind originated in the plateau of Anahuac, migrated northwest, around Behring's Strait, then traveled southwest, till they reached Palestine. Or the Mexicans, in canoes, crossed the Atlantic, in the face of trade winds, and traversed the Mediterranean sea, till they reached Palestine. The Aztecs themselves say they came from the Northwest, and did not have history of their own tribe extending back beyond the twelfth century, and the history of their predecessors in Mexico does not extend back of the seventh century. Then the Mexicans gave laws and ideas to Hebrews and Christians hundreds of years before Mexicans existed? Such is Scientific Infidelity. This entire field of thought should carefully be explored by Christian scholarship, and the falsehoods of Oriental systems, and the falsehoods of Infidels in regard to them, be exposed.

To the assertion that Christianity plagiarized from Grecian philosophy, we reply, that we can trace Mosaism back long anterior to the origin of any Grecian system. Christianity is the development and completion of Mosaism, and not of any Grecian system. The exclusiveness of the Hebrews, their jealousy of any change in their religion, at least after the days of Ezra, the scrupulous care with which they guarded their collection of sacred books from corruption after that time, their belief that it alone was a revelation, and that all other systems were false and abominations, utterly forbid the idea that the Hebrews borrowed from Greeks, even if we could not prove Mosaism to be nearly a thousand years older than any Grecian system. We have Christianity in the writings of Paul, and in the sayings of Jesus in the Gospels. Jesus knew nothing, in a human way, of the Grecian systems. We can see that the system of Jesus and his apostles is a development and comple-

tion of Mosaism, a thousand years older than any Grecian system; but we can see no such connection with any Grecian system. The hostility of Christianity to philosophy, and of philosophy to Christianity, forbids any idea of plagiarism. The Hebrews were scattered abroad over Africa and Asia 800 years before Christ, and hundreds of years before the origin of any Grecian system. They had their sacred books with them, and established synagogues in centers of trade and thought. They were traders and wealthy, and came in contact with the active, intelligent portion of the people, and the thought of the ages and lands in which they lived. There is every reason to believe that Egyptians, Grecians and Orientals borrowed from them. We can prove that parts of other nations borrowed from Hebrew poets. That philosophers borrowed from the Hebrews is claimed by Justyn and other Christian writers, in their controversies with philosophers in the second century. When Grecian philosophers state that they studied philosophy in Egypt and Asia; where the Hebrews had synagogues, there is every reason to believe that they came in contact with Hebrew thought. There was opportunity for Greeks to borrow from Hebrews, but none for Hebrews to borrow from Greeks, for Hebrew books were completed before the origin of Grecian systems, from which it is claimed they were borrowed. How does the skeptic prove that what he knows of Egyptian philosophy was not modified largely by Hebrew thought, since the Hebrews were in contact with Egyptian thought since the day of Solomon, and were in Egypt since the day of Rehoboam? There is more reason to believe that the Egyptians borrowed of the Hebrews, than that the Hebrews borrowed of the Egyptians. These hints will, it is hoped, help others to pursue this line of thought till the truth is established.

CLARK BRADEN.

OATHS, JUDICIAL AND PROFANE.

For men verily swear by the greater and an oath for confirmation is an end of all strife.—Heb. 6:16.

DEFINITIONS.

Oath.—(1.) A solemn affirmation or declaration made with an appeal to God for the truth of what is affirmed. (2.) A careless and blasphemous use of the name of the Divine Being, or anything divine or sacred, either by way of appeal or as a profane exclamation or ejaculation.—*Webster.*

An appeal to God in attestation of the truth of what you say, or in confirmation of what you promise or undertake.—*Killo.*

Quod autem affirmate, quasi Deo teste, promiseris id tenendum est. Jam enim non ad iram deorum qua nulla est, sed ad iustitiam et ad fidem pertinet.—*Cicero.*

"An outward pledge given by the person taking it that his attestation or promise is made under an immediate sense of responsibility to God.—*Tyler.*

In its broadest sense the term is used to include all forms of attestation by which a party signifies that he is bound in conscience to perform the act faithfully and truly.—*Bouvier in Law Dictionary.*

"A religious act by which the party makes God not only witness the truth and sincerity of his promise, but also to avenge his imposture or violated faith."—*Toulier.*

"A solemn invocation of the vengeance of the Deity upon the witness if he do not declare the whole truth so far as he knows it. *Starkie.*

"A religious asservation by which a person renounces the mercy and imprecates the vengeance of Heaven if he do not speak the truth."—*Leach.*

Like definitions could be easily quoted from other high authorities, almost at pleasure, but these are abundant to indicate the true character of an oath, whether judicial or of any other sort.

Judicial.—(1.) Pertaining or appropriate to courts of justice or the judges thereof. (2.) Practiced or employed in the administration of justice.—*Webster*.

Profane.—Specifically, irreverent in language; taking the name of God in vain; given to swearing; blasphemous.—*Webster*.

Other languages, ancient and modern, have terms similar in signification with those defined above. The English word *oath* comes from the Saxon word *eth*, which is very nearly identical with the German *eid*; and these have very nearly equivalents in the Latin *jus jurandum* or *juramentum*, the Greek *horkos*, and the Hebrew *aleh* and *shevuah*. Indeed every language seems to be supplied with one or more words that fill the juratory office. Paul expresses an acknowledged truth of very wide application when he says, "For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is an end of all strife." The form of the oath and the manner of administering it may differ greatly, but the essence remains the same. The most sacred and binding oath is everywhere in the name of the supreme object of worship and adoration, whether such object be the true God, some false god, the monarch, some ancestor or child, the sceptre of the king, the sword of the warrior, or some other person or thing held most sacred.

In the original conception of oaths, two notions were involved, the human and the divine. In every such oath there centers the notions that man is a moral agent, and that God is the vindicator of truth and justice. The former commits the person to tell the truth; the latter recognizes the fact that God sees and knows all things, and that he will punish the false swearer. The religious element enters into every such oath. When an oath is of a judicial character, any wilful deviation is called perjury. When not of a judicial or covenantal character, whether true or false, it is termed profanity.

The form of the oath does not materially effect the essence which lays in appeal to Deity. The modern English form, "So help me God," closely corresponds with the Latin of the early centuries of the Christian era, *sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc sacra Evangelia*, "So help me God and these sacred Gospels." The latter clause has been dropped, but the custom of kissing the Bible or laying a hand upon it, has a similar import. This is also in harmony with the Jewish custom of appealing to the Law. The lifting of the hand to Heaven, the placing of the hand under the thigh,

passing between the parts of slain animals, sucking of each other's blood, tasting of wine, and numerous other ceremonies, are only devices to add sanctity to the oath. This is probably as true of the Christian when, with uplifted hand, or lips pressed to the sacred volume or the emblematic cross, he gives sacred pledge of his truthful intentions, or of the Jew, when, with covered head, he swears upon the Pentateuch, the Mohammedan who swears upon the Koran, the Gentoo, who touches the foot of a Brahmin, the Brahmin who touches the hand of another priest, the Chinaman who breaks a saucer, or any other religionist, indicating his appeal to his Deity.

From what has now been said, it will be readily seen that swearing by any other being or thing than God, is a detraction from him, and is a species of Idolatry, or at least an evidence of such idolatrous devotions. This is implied in the following passages of scripture: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain," (Deut. 5:11.) "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name." (Deut. 6:13.) "Ye shalt not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God." (Lev. 19:12).

The subject having been thus defined, it may be conveniently and advantageously treated under the following heads:

- I. Oaths among the Patriarchs.
- II. Oaths among the Jews.
- III. Oaths among the Heathens.
- IV. Oaths among Christians.
- V. Profanity and Perjury.

I. OATHS AMONG THE PATRIARCHS.

There is no example of oath-taking among the Antediluvians. But since all the regularly formed governments known to us have provided for oaths of confirmation, it is fair to infer that the nations before the Flood had such provisions, for it is pretty evident that they had organized governments. It is probable, too, from the class of sins that characterized these wicked Antediluvians, that profanity may have been one of the sins for which they were destroyed. But this is only conjectural. It is better to rest upon assured premises. From Abraham to Moses there is no lack of testimony upon the question. The following scriptures will suffice as examples of proof texts: "And Abram said to the king of Sodom,

I have lifted up my hand unto the Lord, the most high God, the possessor of Heaven and earth, that I will not take from a thread even to a shoe latchet, and I will not take anything that is thine, lest thou shouldst say, I have made Abram rich." (Gen. 14:22-23.) There we have the oath with uplifted hand, signifying an appeal to Jehovah. "And it came to pass at that time that Abimelech and Phichol, the chief captains of his host, spake unto Abraham, saying, God is with thee in all that thou doest: Now, therefore, swear unto me here by God that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, nor with my son, nor with my son's son. * * * And Abraham said, I will swear." (Gen. 21:22-24).

"And Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had, Put, I pray thee, thy right hand under my thigh, and I will make thee swear by the Lord," etc. (Genesis 24:2-3).

"And the time drew nigh that Israel must die; and he called his son Joseph, * * * And he said, Swear unto me." (Gen. 47:29-31).

Many other passages might be introduced to show that oaths were common among the Patriarchs and that they were approved of God, when of a proper character.

II. OATHS AMONG THE JEWS.

That the Law of Moses authorized judicial oaths, and that they were practiced by the Israelites and approved of God, is susceptible of abundant proof. The following passages will suffice for the present purpose: "Then beware lest thou forget the Lord which brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shall swear by his name." (Deut. 6:12-13).

"But Joshua had said unto the two men who had spied out the country, Go into the harlot's house and bring out thence the woman, and all that she hath, as ye swear unto her." (Josh. 6:22).

"And David sware unto Saul," etc. 1 Sam. 24:22).

False and profane oaths were severely condemned by the Law of Moses and the Prophets, as witnesseth the following Scriptures:

"Or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein." (Lev. 6:3).

"For the land is full of adulterers; for because of swearing the land mourneth." (Jer. 23:10).

"By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood." (Hos. 4:2).

Profanity and perjury are here ranked with adultery, murder, and all the grosser crimes, which were the causes of Israel's downfall and captivity. See also Jer. 5:7; Zeph. 1:5; Amos 8:14. Modern nations should heed the admonition.

III. OATHS AMONG THE HEATHEN.

We have abundant evidence in the classics and elsewhere, that both judicial and profane swearing were common among the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Persians, and other ancient heathen nations. But as this fact does not materially affect the argument concerning the righteousness or wrongness of oaths, a mere reference for completeness of analysis, will be sufficient for our present purpose.

For scriptural allusion to the custom among the heathen, the reader is referred to the following Scriptures: 2 Chron. 36:13; Josh. 9:15.

IV. OATHS AMONG CHRISTIANS.

Hitherto we have been upon undisputed ground. But now we enter a realm of much controversy. Many pious people, with strong desire to be strictly loyal to Christ, have thought oaths, under all circumstances, to be prohibited to Christians. The Society of Friends, the Moravians, and many others, are thus minded. The following passages are chiefly relied upon by them as sustaining their prohibitory notions on the subject: "Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say to you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." (Matt. 5:33-37).

"But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay, lest ye fall into condemnation." (Jas. 5:12).

The occasion for this prohibition is more fully set forth by the Savior in the following passage:

"Woe unto you, blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon." (Matt. 23:16-22).

From the above it is evident that the Jews sought to evade the law against profanity in the ways indicated in the passage. It is against this sinful effort at evasion that the Savior remonstrates and directs his broader restriction. In this paragraph, as in those against murder, adultery, and other crimes mentioned by him in his memorable sermon, the Savior goes back of the overt act, and locates responsibility in the intention. Under this interpretation it is possible to become a murderer without having killed any one, to become an adulterer without having committed adultery. So the man who should attempt to evade the law against profanity by any futile substitution of terms, was still a blasphemer at heart; and in the eyes of God equally guilty with the actual profaner of the name of God. Christians who are in the habit of using mutilated names of the Deity, or other by-words, should remember that they are guilty of profanity. The Savior's declaration, "Swear not at all," is directed against them as well as against the Jews who attempted similar evasions of the law.

That the prohibition, "Swear not at all," is directed against these evasive forms of profanity, and not against judicial oaths, is further evident from the fact that the Savior, in Matt. 5:33-37, proceeds to distribute the general prohibition into four specifications, namely, swearing by "heaven," the "earth," "Jerusalem," and the "head." These specifications, which certainly illustrate the scope of the general command, make no allusion to judicial swearing, which was authorized and required by the Law, which was still in force.

The fact that Jehovah, Jesus, Angels, and the Apostles took oaths would seem to forbid the notion that such oaths are forbidden to Christians. In proof of the assertion just made, the following Scriptures are cited:

"And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." (Ex. 6:8).

"For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself." (Heb. 6:13).

"Behold I have sworn by my great name," etc. (Jer. 44:26).

"And the High Priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, thou hast said." (Matt. 26:63,64).

"And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the land, lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever and ever," etc. (Rev. 10:5, 6).

"Moreover I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet unto Corinth." (2 Cor. 1:23).

"Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." (Gal. 1:20).

In the light of the definitions already given, these, and many like passages, record oaths made and approved by God, Christ, angels, and inspired men. That must be a false exegesis which would make the teachings of Jesus to conflict with these examples. That Jesus strictly prohibited even the attempted evasions of the law against profanity, is beyond dispute; but that he prohibited judicial oaths does not appear either from the precepts or the recorded examples of the New Testament. But it is sometimes urged by those who take a contrary position from that of this article, that the early Christians refused to take oaths. No doubt there is sufficient proof of the correctness of this assertion. But the question still remains as to *why* they thus refused. May it not have been, and was it not because of the nature of these oaths? For the most part they were heathen oaths, to recognize which would have been idolatry. Nor would it appear strange if some, under the pressure and heat of such a controversy, should go to the extremes of some modern sectaries, and torture the language of Christ and of James into a total prohibition. Some have placed Justin, Irenæus, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, and other eminent

church fathers, in the list of those who held even judicial oaths as unchristian. But it is not conceded that all of these, when fairly interpreted, so held. In any event, however, the notions of these would not weigh against the practices of Christ and his apostles. Christ and his apostles did not teach one thing and do another. But it is evident that they did take judicial and kindred forms of oaths.

V. PROFANITY AND PERJURY.

It has already been seen that both God and man have ever held profanity and perjury as grave offences against religion, morality, and the ends of good government. Somehow, too, these two crimes seem to stand closely related, and have been treated in divine law, and in human law, statutory and common, under the same general heading. It is not asserted that every profane person is a perjurer; but it is affirmed that profanity is a schooling that makes perjury easy, the one follows the other as cause and effect, at least in tendency. The suppression of profanity is, then, a question of much moment, not to the church-man alone, but to the statesman and philanthropist as well. Profanity lessens the permanency of the state and breaks down the moral and protective basis of society. We have already seen that this was one of the crimes that caused the Jewish captivity. Doubtless it was an alarmingly growing crime in the days of the Savior. This has a striking illustration in the case of Peter, "who began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man." (Matt. 26:74). A falsehood, thus maintained by such oaths and imprecations, and by such a man, shows to what depths of sin the public conscience had then sunk on this subject. This moral degeneration was but the prelude of an early national destruction.

This crime of profanity, which has been among the forerunners of the downfall of so many nations, is now fearfully common among us. Our moral natures are constantly liable to be shocked by profane utterances on the street, in the car, office, or shop. The time was when blasphemers of this sort paid some deference to the presence of ladies, children, and known religionists; but, alas, that day has, to a great extent, passed away. Yet this profanity is a transgression of the common law, and of statutory law, as well as of divine law. Bouvier, in his admirable *Law Dictionary*, defines the crime as follows: "A disrespect to the name of God or his

divine providence. This is variously punished by the statutes of the several states."

Ordinance No 29, of the city where the writer lately lived, read as follows: "Any person who shall, within the limits of this city, publicly curse, swear, or publicly use profane or blasphemous language * * shall be deemed guilty of a public misdemeanor, and shall be punished accordingly." Most other cities have similar enactments. But they stand as little more than a dead letter upon the statutes of our towns, cities, and states. So far as known to the writer, all authorities on criminal law have treated profanity, as well as perjury, as a misdemeanor, a crime to be punished under common and statutory law.

As a sample of what these say, the following passage from *Bishop on Criminal Law*, is here introduced: "We have already seen that profane swearing is an indictable nuisance at common law. It is a species of blasphemy. * * * Whether the principle that makes these so is that they tend to undermine Christianity, which is a part of our common law, or that they disturb the peace, and corrupt the morals of the community, is a question not fully settled. Perhaps we may even take another view, namely, that reverence to God and religion—Christianity being our form of religion—is essential to man, who is injured in his nature and being when this reverence is impaired; or, still another, that these offences so shock his purer and higher sensibilities as to create an injury to him, against which he needs protection, precisely as against an assault. Perhaps these several considerations and some others may be deemed to enter, more or less, into the policy of the law. In any view, these offences enter into the family of public nuisances."

The same author cites numerous examples and references in which the above principle has been sustained by the courts of this country and of Great Britain.

Hieracles, who lived at Alexandria about the middle of the fifth century, said, what modern experience has fully confirmed: "From a common custom of swearing, men easily slide into perjury; therefore, if thou wouldst not be perjured, do not use to swear."

Reason and experience show that perjury keeps about even pace with profanity, and both are fearfully on the increase in this country. It is a lamentable fact that lawyers now often look far

more at the character of the witnesses and juries than at the justice of their case. The flippant oath of the street is aided by the scarcely less flippant and blasphemous administration of the judicial oaths, in making perjurers. So alarming has this crime become, that it is a common saying that "an oath amounts to nothing." In view of this appalling fact, it is not strange that officials take oaths to maintain the law and are the first to violate the law. Take, for instance, the average policeman of our cities, who takes an oath to support and assist in enforcing the laws of the city which he is to serve. Among these laws is usually one against profanity and blasphemy. But if arrests are to be made for the violation of such an ordinance, how often would it happen that the policeman would, of right, be the first arrested! The same fact often exists on up through the various grades of the judicial and executive ranks till it is clothed in the ermine of the Supreme Court, or sits in gubernatorial or presidential chairs. Why should we expect officials, high or low, to enforce the law against others, when they themselves are notorious violators of the same law? Does not the fact that party interests and moral indifference so stultify the minds and consciences of thousands of church members as to allow them to encourage such men by their votes? If the stream is to be made pure, the fountain must be first cleansed. The people are the fountain of power and influence in this country. If we would make our courts courts of justice; if we would insure political and official integrity; and if we would long preserve the nation as well as maintain the purity of the church, reverence for the name of God and for holy things must be restored. When profanity and perjury abound it may be taken as an assurance of approaching national destruction.

Reference has already been made to a certain class of attorneys who not only endeavor to distort evidence, confuse witnesses, but actually to employ false witnesses. As early as March 3rd, 1825, Congress provided that, "If any person or persons shall knowingly or wilfully procure any such perjury to be committed, every person so offending shall be deemed guilty of subornation of perjury, and shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine, not to exceed \$2,000, and imprisonment and confinement to hard labor, not to exceed five years."

"God is not mocked," and whatsoever an individual or a nation sows will inevitably produce its legitimate fruits. Under this rule

it is feared that, as a nation, we are sowing for destruction in the corruptions and distrusts growing out of irreverent and blasphemous oath-taking. It is incumbent upon the press, platform, and pulpit, the statesman and economist, no less than the theologian, to make a strenuous effort to stay this fearful and growing social, moral, and political evil and crime.

G. T. CARPENTER.

A DOUBT RAISED CONCERNING THE TYPICAL NATURE OF OLD TESTAMENT INSTITUTIONS.

There is, perhaps, no theological notion more generally received than that of the typical character of the Old Testament institutions. It is the object of this essay to call in question the validity of that doctrine. The writer is not unmindful of the fact that the simple act of raising such a doubt will be construed into sheer temerity by some; and, perhaps, by others be even more severely criticised. There are a great many lectures and sermons resting on this foundation; and to disturb the foundation is to unsettle these favorite discourses, and to become an iconoclast, which in all ages has involved great hazard. Hence, whatever may be the convictions of the writer on this subject, and however settled these convictions, he has only ventured here to raise a doubt as to the correctness of this popular doctrine. Tentative and experimental methods of searching after truth are still held to be respectable; and the mere fact that a theory is generally received does not place upon it the seal of infallibility, nor lift it out of the sphere of investigation. History teaches us that many long cherished and accepted views have been reviewed and abandoned, and that "history repeats itself" has become proverbial. Such considerations as these have given strength enough to ply the oars, and steer out on the sea of investigation just far enough to "raise a *doubt* concerning the typical nature of Old Testament institutions."

It is not denied that there are *resemblances* to be observed in the institutions of the Old and the New Testaments. If these are both revelations of God; if the services and offices, and general functions of each are of Divine authority, it would be a remarkable exception in His works that analogies do not here abound. Indeed we do not think it putting the case too strong to say that the absence of analogy in the religions of the Old and the New Testaments would of itself afford valid ground of argument against the Divine origin of one or both these religions. The resemblances,

however, of the services of these two dispensation are not enough to constitute the doctrine of their typical and anti-typical character. This is an important distinction, and to make it clear in the beginning a few quotations are here given from an article on "types" found in the "Treasury of Bible Knowledge," a book edited by the "Rev. John Ayre, M. A., of Gonville and Cains College, Cambridge, and published by D. Appleton & Co., New York:

"We may define a type, theologically considered, as the symbol of some future person or thing, the example prepared and designed to prefigure that future person or thing. What is so prefigured is commonly called the anti-type. The reality of a type depends on the truthfulness of the supposed relationship: It is not enough to discover a resemblance. The typical relation must be intended, that is, the type must be designed and prepared by God."

* * * * "We conclude that type was connected with anti-type, not by an accidental similarity of outward circumstances, but by a divinely appointed inward relation of one to the other, involving the idea of fulfilment." * * * * "In this prospective aspect, type was a kind of prophecy, distinguished indeed from ordinary prophecy, because it prefigured while prophecy predicted, but yet serving in a manner, the same purpose, and admitting illustration on similar principles. This, then, the real and the designed connection between the Old Testament and the New, is the basis of typical interpretation."

With this plain definition and these explanations and statements, which it is presumed will be endorsed by all holding to the doctrine in question, the discussion may now be fairly opened.

What benefit or advantage is supposed to be derived from types? And in whose favor do the benefits accrue? It will hardly be contended that the Creator stood in any need of these supposed models to aid him in future operations. His type was in thought; his model was the Divine conception after which he wrought. He is no apprenticed mechanic that needs to have before his eye a form after the fashion of which he is to build. That man was the one to be profited by these typical institutions will no doubt be generally held as the correct view. And that the chief, if not the sole, advantage which he derived from them was found in their educational effect, in the religious culture received through them. It is generally supposed that men anciently came to their altars with their sacrifices as Christians now come to the Lord's table and the

Lord's supper; that they saw in their services and symbolized the great sacrifice of Christ on the cross. We here raise the question as to the correctness of this assumption. Did men anciently so understand their sacrifices? Did not the Jew look upon his services as the end and substance of the whole thing? Did he expect these to vanish as mere shadows, and to be supplanted by higher Christian institutions? If so, how are we to explain the reluctance with which the Jewish Christians abandoned their Jewish institutions? With all the anti-types of Christianity in their possession, they not only insisted on retaining the types in their own worship, but contended that these things should be made conditions of salvation to the Gentiles, a state of the case impossible, had they looked upon their institutions as mere shadows. The truth is that the Jewish mind in the aggregate, whatever may have been the exceptions in the occasional lofty visions of inspired prophets, looked upon these supposed types as the *ne plus ultra* of religion. Hence, while they were willing to accept other revelations, it was only that they might be incorporated with their stock in hand, and not that the one was to supercede the other. And why should they think otherwise? They were not taught to hold their religion as symbolical of another and a better one. Moses, their lawgiver, in delivering to the Jews their elaborate system of worship, gave it under the most solemn sanctions of its own verity, reality and perpetuity, never once hinting of its temporary and typical character. "Observe and hear all these words which I command thee, that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee forever." Deut. 12:28. When the Saviour appointed the Lord's Supper as a symbolical institution he was careful to designate it as such. "Do this in memory of me." "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till he come." And we will have occasion to observe, before we are done, that when Moses delivered to the Jewish people any institution that was symbolic in its nature, he, too, was thoughtful and wise enough to so instruct them. And if we find him doing this in certain special cases, and omitting it just in the manner and the matter fatal to the popular doctrines of typology, may we not hold it as conclusive against such doctrines? Of this, more hereafter.

Let us now gather up and cast anchor a moment before getting too far at sea. We have assumed that, if these ancient institutions bore the typical character usually assigned to them, it must have

been for the education of the people to whom they were delivered; that the *cui bono* question concerning them cannot be answered upon any other hypothesis. But, if it be true that they did not so educate the people, and that the people did not so understand them, and that the teachers did not so deliver these institutions, does not the foundation on which this whole theory of typology rests give way? Let it not be inferred that the writer denies the fact that these old institutions served to "educate the people" *in a way*. "The law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." But the question is raised as to whether these institutions educated the people in the way of the popular doctrine of types; whether, looking upon these as mere symbols, they were brought, in faith and hope, to anticipate and contemplate better things in Christ Jesus. Nor is it denied that there were prevalent this faith and hope of better things; only, that this condition of mind was not superinduced by the typical nature of their dominant religion. This state of public expectancy is easily accounted for on other grounds.

Before leaving this branch of the discussion attention is called to the significant fact that this idea of a typical relation between the older forms of religion and Christianity is a New Testament thought, and is wholly unknown in the Old Testament Scriptures. Reason would teach us to expect just the reverse; since, as has been explained, the people under the old dispensation were the ones to be benefitted by a correct understanding of their own institutions. The fact, however, that it is a New Testament conception seems to indicate that the term *τύπος* is lifted out of its narrow and literal significance, and given greater latitude of meaning.

Let us now bend our thoughts to this single inquiry: Did the Apostles use the term *τύπος* in the sense of "prefigure"? If not, then is there absolutely any ground on which the doctrine of types and anti-types may stand? It is a notable circumstance in connection with the use of the term *τύπος* in the New Testament that, while it occurs *fifteen* times, our translators have employed *eight* different words in putting it into English dress—"print," "figure," "form," "example," "ensample," "pattern," "fashion," "manner." Does not this suggest the idea that *τύπος* was used by the New Testament writers with great freedom? In further confirmation of this is the fact that in discussing the relation of Judaism and Christianity, Paul employs five different Greek terms to express this supposed symbolic relation—*τύπος*, *ἀντίτυπον*, *ὑπόδειγμα*,

σκιὰ, παραβολή. That is, he declares the things under the law to be "types," "anti-types," "patterns," "shadows," and "parables." Now, it cannot be denied that every one of these words involves the idea of two things correlated. Yet the bold, free style in which the Apostles use the words appears incompatible with the common notion of typical relation. The correlation involved does not necessarily imply the idea of original, intentional *prefiguration*. It appears to be wholly an after-thought; the result of imagination expressing itself in the oriental, tropical style. The mode of expression is essentially that of a mind thoroughly ingrained with Jewish ideas, and set with mosaics of the law, and afterwards "born again" into the kingdom of Christ. In this new relation it looks back upon the old religion, and begins to run the lines of comparison and contrast; and when a writer now would employ the terms resemblance, similitude, analogy, &c., the Jew uses the stronger expressions, "type," "anti-type," "pattern," "shadow," "parable." That this view is possibly correct appears from the following considerations:

1. Paul refers to these items in Jewish history as both *types*. 1 Cor. 10:6, and *anti-types*, Heb. 9:24, which is not easily understood, if he held to the popular doctrine of typology. His mind seems to glide freely, and, in a sense, loosely over this subject—loosely, in comparison with the exact, mechanical methods of those who hold to the idea of prefiguration of types.

2. These terms occur in cases where, confessedly, they can mean nothing more than analogy or general resemblance. "The like figure"—*anti-type*—"whereunto baptism doth also now save us," 1 Pet. 3:21. No man, it is presumed, can believe that God intended by the flood, or anything connected with it, to "prefigure" the ordinance of baptism, or anything involved in it. The anti-typical nature of baptism is here wholly an after-thought on the part of Peter; and he evidently means to assert nothing more by it than the general fact of analogy. And so when Paul says that "Adam is the figure"—*type*—"of him that was to come," Rom. 5:14; and, again, when he calls the Thessalonians "ensamples"—*types*—"to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia," 1 Thes. 1:7, and says to the Philippians, "Ye have us for examples"—*types*—Phil. 3:17, he cannot mean to affirm that there was an original intention to prefigure anything, or even to establish a model in the lives and characters of the Thessalonians and the Apostles. The

fact that they answered this purpose of example is an after-thought.

3. It is in harmony with the general style of New Testament literature. When Matthew refers to the slaughtering of the children of Bethlehem, by order of King Herod, and says, "Then was *fulfilled* that which was spoken by Jeremy, the prophet"—he evidently uses the term "*fulfilled*," aside from its literal and ordinary acceptation; since it is a well known fact that this prophecy had no allusion whatever to this event. The words of the old prophet certainly found an appropriate application to this sad transaction, and fitly described the condition of things in Bethlehem; and, *in some such sense*, were "*fulfilled*." Paul, in discussing the subject of the two covenants, in the fourth chapter of his Galatian epistle, says of the bond woman and the free, and their two sons, "Which things are an allegory." Now are we to infer that God meant, through the adulterous relations of Abraham, to prefigure his two covenants with men? Or is this only an example of Paul's rhetorical style? He finds here in these facts of history an illustration of his subject at once graphic and striking; and his vigorous mind instantly seizes upon it, and utilizes it. It is Paul's "*allegory*," not God's; it is an after consideration, and not an original design. In the same manner is the simile of the Savior to be interpreted, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." John 3: 14. This beautiful simile occurs to the mind of the Great Teacher, and is employed to illustrate and enforce an important moral lesson; but it is a simile, and nothing more, except in an over sanguine imagination. The miraculous healing of the people in connection with the brazen serpent was designed to meet a present necessity, both in the physical and moral condition of the people. In their distress they needed help, in their moral weakness and tendency to idolatry they needed elevation of thought in the direction of the true God. These facts indicate a point and purpose in the lifting up of the brazen serpent, at once natural and quite sufficient to justify the whole proceeding, without the unwarranted and fanciful notion of the prefiguration of the crucifixion of the Son of God. And so with every event, and every institution of the older dispensations; they were natural, and not artificial provisions; they grew out of the prevalent condition of things, and were not engrafted as a foreign element upon the life of the people; they met a present felt want, and did

not point the minds of the worshipers to the future; they were, in every instance, and in every particular, just the things to suit the times, the circumstances, and the people, and not a mere provisional arrangement announcing its own unimportance except as a sign of something to come.

In confirmation of this view, let us now consider what will be generally regarded, no doubt, as a fair and complete test case, the *paschal lamb*. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. 5:7. The analogies observed between the original institution of the passover in its relation to the Israelites in bondage in Egypt, their deliverance, their passage through the Red Sea, etc., and the death of Christ Jesus in its relation to the human family in sin, in regeneration, in salvation, etc., the analogies here are so numerous, and so impressive that by common consent the whole arrangement in one is elevated and dignified into a sublime prefiguration and prophecy of the other. It would seem to be a species of cruelty to spoil the many fine sermons all along here; but truth is of more value than many sermons.

That Christ is often referred to as the "Lamb of God" by the inspired writers, all Bible readers well know. He is also called the "bread," the "rock," the "vine," the "shepherd," etc. These are all metaphorical expressions, a style of composition employed by inspired and uninspired writers alike; and for the same reason that it is more pleasing, forcible and instructive than the plain. How could a Jew prevent his mind, or his tongue, or his pen from gliding into such metaphorical language as the following?: "We have an altar," "Let us offer the sacrifice," "The blood of sprinkling," "The smoke of the incense," "The Lamb of God," "Christ our Passover," &c., &c., all figures of speech borrowed from the scenes of his daily life, and transferred to christian thought. What evidence have we beyond a figure of speech that the paschal lamb was a type of Christ? If it prefigured him, it must have been so understood by those who observed the "feast of the passover." If it did not stand before the minds of Moses and the Israelites in the capacity of a symbolic institution, then may we not infer that it bore no such character to any one? If the Lord God held such a view in his own mind, would he not, at least, have hinted it to the great law-giver of Israel? Facts are stubborn things. The following account of the institution of the passover is found in the twelfth chapter of the book of Exodus:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses and to Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, Speak unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for every house. * * * * * Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year, * * * and you shall keep it till the fourteenth day of the same month, and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening. And they shall take the blood and strike it on the two side-posts, and on the upper door-post of the houses. * * * * * And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever."

After receiving these and other detailed instructions which I have omitted, we read in the same chapter that, "Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, "Draw out and take you a lamb, according to your families, and kill the passover. * * For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the side-posts, the Lord will pass over the door. * * * * * And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons forever. * * * And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses. And the people bowed and worshipped."

Is it not a very significant fact that in all the minute record we have here of this original feast, there is no trace of thought regarding its *prefigurative* nature? And this is the more remarkable in view of the careful explanations and instructions given concerning the institution. The occasion and the opportunity were not wanting for such a lesson. "And this day shall be unto you for a *memorial*"—looking back to your deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and not forward to the death of Christ. "When your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service"?—What a fine opportunity for teaching them that a "better covenant and better promises" were "shadowed" forth in this ordinance; but not a word of it—"Ye shall say, It is the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt."

If the paschal lamb were not a type, if it did not look to the

future, and indicate the sacrifice of Christ, then may we not doubt the whole doctrine of the typical character of Old Testament institutions? That man who will draw the line that separates the literal and the figurative in the word of God, draw it clearly, so that we may know certainly when we are on this side and when on that—that man will confer the greatest benefit on the world, and render his name immortal. Language is so mercurial and thought so ethereal that we are scarcely conscious of our own transitions, even in the ordinary operations of the mind, as it glides into and out of the plain and the tropical styles. The oriental mind was naturally florid, and the Scriptures abound in tropes, and the most gorgeous imagery. Where the reader would perhaps say, "Except you become like Christ, you have no life in you," the Savior said, "Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood you have no life in you." When the reader would say, "The services of Jewish Priests in the tabernacle were analogous to the intercession of Christ," Paul would say, "Which things serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."

Analogies abound throughout all departments of natural history, and why not in sacred history? There is nothing more pleasing to the human mind than the discovery of analogies. The unity of design, and the continuity of purpose everywhere manifested in the works of God inspire us with confidence in his all pervading and ever present Spirit. Let us not, however, mistake or misapply the law of analogy, and construe it into an arbitrary and mechanical principle. Let us not suppose that God operates unreasonably or unnaturally. Analogies, or as Paul would style them, types and shadows in religion, as in nature, grow out of a *law of necessity*. In the very nature of the case, some things resemble others. The child on the floor playing with its toys, building houses, training animals, sailing ships, is the "shadow" of the coming man. The lower forms of animal life belonging to the early periods of history are typical of the later and higher forms. Not that certain peculiarities were placed in the child, or in the lower animals for the purpose of prefiguring something else to come, but because life, in manifesting itself at different periods of development, must always be analogically related. That hardy pioneer who fifty years ago entered the wilds of the West, and built for his family the humble log cabin, and cleared his little patches of ground for potatoes and corn, is to-day the rich man living in a splendid brick mansion, sur-

rounded by a magnificent estate. As you look on this scene and on that, you cannot fail to observe resemblances. That cabin and this mansion both have walls, and doors, and windows; those patches of ground, and these broad fields are both enclosed by fences, are both cultivated, and both yield of their increase. This similarity, though, does not arise in the fact that the one form of life was adopted *to represent the other*, but in the fact that human life, in its various conditions, demands for its comfort, and its convenience certain arrangements; and these, by a law of necessity, however different, resemble one another. In the one sense, the cabin was not the type, in the other sense, it was the type of the present home of fortune.

The religious feeling is natural to the human family. Man is a worshiper. The forms of his religious service in the several stages of civilization have varied. And there is no study more entertaining than that of man's religious life in its normal development through the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian periods. Analogies abound everywhere. In the nature of the case it could not be otherwise. The resemblances spring from a law of necessity. God's nature is fixed, and absolute, and he has given to man a distinct, moral nature correlating it with truth, and the fundamental laws of the Divine government. Out of this combination of forces and influences there arises a uniformity in outline, notwithstanding a diversity in details. What the Patriarchs did about their crude altars, what the Jews did in their tabernacle and temple service, were just the things to be done then and there; and they were adopted because of their fitness, because they were suited to the condition of the people, and met their wants as nothing else could have done. What Christ did, during his earthly ministry, his teachings, his miracles, his suffering, his death, were just the things to be done at the time and place; and what is appointed for Christian men now to do in the Church of the Living God is wise and right in itself independent of any supposed anti-typical relation. Through all these dispensations there runs the law of analogy. The race had its period of childhood in which we see the "types," and "shadows" and "patterns," and "examples" of coming manhood. And the scriptures intimate that this similarity will run on into Heaven itself; that the forms in which the saved shall worship the Savior, and celebrate their redemption will not be unlike the things of the past. Not that an artificial arrangement of types and anti-

types prevails throughout these several periods of human history, but that man's spiritual nature, everywhere and always, speaks a language homogeneous; and that lower forms of life, in the very nature of things, adumbrate the higher.

A. B. JONES.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP WITH REFERENCE TO THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Man in his present state of existence is subject to two systems of government. First: Divine government, embracing the laws of nature and revelation. Second: Human government, as it applies to man as a member of society, fixing his relations therein, and regulating and restraining his conduct. Had Adam maintained his primeval condition, the laws of God, natural and revealed, would have been sufficient, and no human government necessary, as no man would have had any disposition to invade the rights of his neighbor. After the fall, the disposition to disregard the rights of his fellow-man, was at once developed, in the tragic fact of the murder of his brother by the first-born of men. This aggressive and devilish spirit went on from bad to worse until God himself declared that "every imagination of the heart of man was evil." He therefore destroyed this wicked and degenerate stock of men, and from righteous Noah, produced a new and better type of humanity. But the effects of the fall descended with the race; and the sad fate of the antediluvians demonstrated the necessity of human government. A temporal power, with authority from society in the aggregate, was needed to punish evil doers and restrain them from trampling on the rights of their fellow-men. The peace, order, and very existence of society absolutely demanded it. Hence God, in addition to the power conferred on Adam, to multiply and replenish the earth, and have dominion over the lower animals, delegated to society through Noah the fundamental principles of human government, by directing that blood should be required for blood, and life for life. And after dispersing the race from Babel, and dividing it into distinct nationalities, speaking different languages—in order, as we believe, to make human government more practical and effective, because more necessary—He gave these nations a model in the Mosaic Law, in which may be found the fundamental principles of all just human government, whether we

consider it with reference to the civil or criminal codes of the state.

We have made these preliminary statements as a major premise for our argument, and especially for the benefit of those Christians, who claim that their only citizenship is in the kingdom of God; that all human government is of the devil; and that no Christian citizen should have anything to do with Cæsar's government. Many pursue this fallacy so far as to decline the right to vote, or to have any voice in the government, which regulates their lives, liberties and property. This position is not only fundamentally wrong in principle, but absolutely ruinous to society, in its practical effects. We see and feel the terrible effects of this suicidal policy throughout the United States, in the oppression, destitution, and moral and social degradation existing among the producing classes, under the unequal laws and iron rule established over the land by the corrupt rings and monopolies now dominating over the liberties of the people.

How was this sad state of affairs brought about? We answer, by the Christian citizenship of the country abandoning the post of duty. When professional politicians began to corrupt the masses with money, intoxicating liquors, and other baleful influences, had the better class of citizens stood by the citadel of their liberties, instead of leaving the ballot-box to the rabble and foreign riff-raff, the state of American politics would to-day have been comparatively pure, instead of the most corrupt of earth. It will not do to assume that because prophecy tells us that these human governments are all to be finally destroyed and supplanted by the government of God, that therefore they are wholly of the devil. We believe that the devil and his angels are upon the earth and in the air around it, and are now manipulating human government, very much as they please; but it is also true that God has a kingdom on the earth, and the citizens of this kingdom are engaged in the most tremendous contest probably known to the universe, with the devil and his cohorts, for the possession of the earth and the dominion of man. And it is because the citizens of God's commonwealth have been derelict in duty, and because the Christian soldiery have abandoned the outposts of defence, that the devil and his legions now have possession of the civil camp, and are intrenched in the very citadel of our liberties; while his spies and his emissaries have invaded the spiritual sanctuary and are controlling and running many of the so-called churches of the land.

That every Christian is not only a citizen of the Commonwealth of God, but also of the State in which he has his temporal existence, and is under obligations to both, is a self-evident proposition. It grows out of the fact that man is a dependent being—dependent not only upon God for every breath of life, but also upon his fellow-man, because his very nature forbids an isolated existence. While murder in the first family and the terrible fate of the antediluvians demonstrated the sad fact that man would not respect the rights of his fellow-man, and that human government was a necessity; hence it was that God through Noah delegated this power to society, and exemplified it for the benefit of the nations, when on Sinai's smoky top, in the midst of thunder and lightning, which shook the mountain and awed the people, He met Moses, the grandest legislator of earth, and transmitted to him the fundamental principles of human government. Therefore we have not only the authority of revelation, but the sanction and example of Jehovah himself, for the necessity and the legitimacy of human government.

What then is the purpose and scope of human government? What are its objects and what are its powers? It is already apparent that the fundamental object of human government is the protection of the person and the property of the citizen. Its powers are for the purpose of restraining and punishing evil doers, who attempt to take the lives, liberties, health, reputation, or property of their fellow-men.

Let us then briefly enquire what is the effect of the liquor traffic upon man individually and upon society. Does it not affect the lives, liberties, health, reputation, property and happiness of citizens, injuriously, or otherwise? What is the nature of these liquors? Are they food or are they poison? It is conceded that the element in all liquors which intoxicates is alcohol. Chemists tell us that alcohol consists of carbon, oxygen and hydrogen; and physiologists inform us that it can neither be digested nor assimilated by the human system, and consequently is not a food. It is defined by the scientific as a stimulant and a poison, recognized to some extent as a medicine, and is useful as a chemical, in mechanics and in some of the fine arts. Physiologists and physicians inform us that alcohol acts as a powerful stimulant to the human system, and if used in sufficient quantities destroys both body and mind, while

experience and observation, as well as history, fearfully corroborate the teachings of science.

We give in this connection the highest medical testimony in Europe and America as to the nature of alcohol and its effects on man. The distinguished Dr. B. W. Richardson, of England, in his Canton lectures, speaking of alcohol, says: "It is neither a food nor a drink suitable for man's natural demands." And Dr. Richardson is fully endorsed by Dr. Willard Parker, the Nestor of American physicians.

Dr. Carpenter, the great English physiologist, appends to his essay on the use of alcoholic liquors, a certificate which he says was signed by over 2600 leading physicians, and which states among other things, "That a very large proportion of human misery including poverty, disease and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic or fermented liquors as beverages." And the National Medical Association of the United States, at its meeting in Detroit, in 1874, adopted this resolution, viz: "That we are of the opinion that the use of alcoholic liquors, as a beverage, is productive of a large amount of physical and mental disease, and that it entails diseased appetites and enfeebled constitution upon offsprings; and that it is the cause of a large percentage of the crime and pauperism in our large cities and country." The foregoing testimony of physiologists is fully corroborated by the experience of thousands of unfortunate drinkers, and by the observation of every intelligent person in the land.

The use of alcoholic liquors consumes the body, degrades and weakens the mind, blunts the moral perception, and eventually destroys the soul. Statistics show that in the United States alone, more than 60,000 men annually sink into drunkard's graves, and fully 600,000 recruits from the great army of moderate drinkers annually take their places in the ranks of the confirmed drunkards.

But some person is ready to say that we have not yet shown a case for the interposition of the government, that men have a right to injure themselves and even destroy their own lives, so long as they do not infringe on the rights of their fellow-citizens. While we deny this proposition we will not now discuss it. But we will show that these 600,000 drunkards while they are annually committing suicide at the rate of ten per cent. of their number, are also destroying the rights of persons—the health, liberty, reputation and property of their own families—probably half a

million of ruined women and three millions of helpless children. Aside from the thousands of poor women and innocent children who are murdered by drunken husbands, aside from the many assaults, personal injuries and other cruelties inflicted on their helpless families by drunkards, we call your attention to the reckless waste and destruction of money and property, designed by a kind Providence, as the means whereby the head of the family may discharge the duties he owes to his wife and children, both by the laws of God and man. On every man, who takes on himself the responsibility of a family, devolves the duty of protecting, supporting, caring for, and educating that family. The drunkard not only fails to discharge these great duties, but deprives his family of the means of supporting themselves by destroying his substance. He beggars those whom he should protect and support; and sinking into a drunkard's grave, leaves them in poverty and ignorance to naturally gravitate into vice and crime. And shall not the State intervene for the protection of these helpless women and children? Have they no rights of person, liberty, reputation, health, happiness or property, to protect? If the great duty of government be to protect the citizens in the enjoyment of these great natural rights, surely the weaker portion of the community are entitled to this protection to the same extent as the stronger. When this cruel evil is staring us in the face, and the rights of person, liberty, and property of thousands of helpless women and children are trampled into ruin before our eyes, shall the sovereign power of the State not intervene for the protection of the helpless? Either the liquor vendor should be responsible in damages to the helpless families of drunkards for all injuries to person and property, resulting from the use of intoxicating drinks sold to said drunkards, or else the State, in the exercise of its sovereignty, should absolutely inhibit the sale of these liquid poisons, which, like a mighty conflagration, is consuming the very vitality of society, and burning out the very substance of the country. The ruinous effects of this terrible traffic is not only felt by the unhappy families of drunkards, but, like a real conflagration, it blasts and withers every element and every interest in society. Let us for a few moments contemplate its deadly effects on the labor, industry, capital, health, morals and public peace of the country, as shown by the statistics taken from the United States census and other reliable sources. In the year 1870 the actual cost of the intoxicating liquors consumed in the

United States was \$619,425,000, more than one-fourth the value of all the productions of farming and stock-growing for the same year, and \$19,000,000 more than all the food and preparations used by the nation for the same year. In 1871 the nation's liquor bill reached 680,036,042 and in 1872 it reached the enormous sum of \$735,720,048, of which latter amount the people of Texas alone paid the sum of \$19,320,000.

Next, let us look for a moment at the great loss to the nation in the way of time and labor. It is estimated that there are about 545,624 men in the United States, engaged in making and selling intoxicating liquors, by wholesale and retail, whose labor at some useful employment would be worth \$272,812,000. As before stated there are 600,000 drunkards, who are not only wasting their substance, but also wasting their time in drinking, and whose loss of time and labor is worth not less than \$150,000,000. The loss of time and industry of about one and a half million of tipplers, not considered drunkards, is estimated at \$146,000,000, making an aggregate in loss of time and industries annually of nearly \$569,000,000 by men engaged in the liquor traffic.

There are many aspects in which the ruinous effects of this terrible evil on society might be noticed, but we shall only mention one other in this connection, and that is the admitted fact shown by the statistics that nine-tenths of all crimes are caused by the use of intoxicating liquors. Of the 14,315 inmates of the Massachusetts prisons, 12,396, or 84 per cent., are reported to have been intemperate. In the Deer Island House of Industry at Boston, 93 per cent. of the inmates trace their misfortunes to intoxicating drinks, and the reports from the Rhode Island State Prison show 90 per cent. of the inmates to have been drinkers. In the year 1867 the State of Pennsylvania paid for criminal and pauper expenses, caused directly by liquor drinking, the sum of \$2,259,210, or an average of \$5.80 for each voter in the State. The same year the paupers and criminals of Philadelphia cost that city \$150,080, or \$11.00 for each voter. The same year the State of Pennsylvania received for license to sell liquors \$317,742, and paid for pauperism and crime caused by the use of liquors \$2,259,910, or in other words the State received from license fourteen cents for every dollar spent for crime and pauperism.

The report of the Commissioner of Education for the year 1872, shows that of the 12,000,000 of scholastic population in the

United States, about 4,000,000 neither attend the public nor the private schools and colleges of the country. These are the unfortunate children of the intemperate, who having neither guardians or protectors, remain in ignorance and naturally gravitate into crime. Here is formed the nursery for crime, and the grand cause for expensive criminal courts and oppressive taxes. Ignorance and intemperance are inseparably connected, and lead as naturally to crime as the "sparks fly upward." It is not only more humane, more in accord with the Christian principle, but absolutely cheaper for the State to educate than to punish children and criminals.

Let the State restrain the liquor traffic, and use the money now expended in punishing crime, for the education of the children of the poor and helpless, and peace and order will at once prevail in society, and then, and not till then, can an economical State government be inaugurated.

But this damning evil does not stop here. This infernal conflagration is not only consuming the life substance, morals and happiness of the present generation, but it casts its dark and sulphurous fumes and smoke across the vail of the future, and hangs like the pall of death over helpless posterity. Painfully true is the declaration of the sacred writer that the sins of the father are visited upon the children to the third and fourth generations. And the laws of nature, as illustrated by the unerring rules of hereditary descent, fully attest the correctness of the same proposition. Thousands of unfortunate human beings are to-day suffering and dying from hereditary disease transmitted to them from their dissipated ancestry.

We need say no more. We have fully stated a case that invokes the interposition of the State. We have shown that this traffic destroys property by the millions of dollars' worth; persons, by the thousands of valuable lives; blasts the liberty, health, reputation and happiness of millions of helpless women and children; and casts its consuming flames far down the line of posterity. Surely this is an evil so affecting person and property that the State might well prohibit its manufacture and sale.

But we are told that alcohol is an article of legitimate commerce, and that a law prohibiting its sale is an interference with the natural rights of the citizen. We reply, that it has never been proposed to interfere with the sale of alcohol, as a legitimate article of commerce. It is only proposed to prohibit its sale as a beverage, upon the ground that it is not a food but a poison, and injurious to

individuals and to the State, as has already been shown. The State should prohibit its sale as a beverage, upon the same ground that it prohibits under heavy penalties poisonous and adulterated foods. Let alcohol be relegated to the drug stores and apothecary shops, like other chemicals and poisons, which are used as medicines, and for mechanical purposes. This leaves the sale of alcohol for all useful purposes in no way interfered with, and only prohibits its sale as a food or a beverage, because it is a poison and injurious in every way to society. The power of the State to do this, and even to determine "what kind of property and business, it will tolerate and protect," was held to be clear by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the celebrated License Cases reported in 5th Howard U. S. Report, page 504. In this decision Woodbury, Justice, uses the following language, quoted by Judge Pittman in his work "Alcohol and the State," page 105, viz: "It is the undoubted and reserved power of any state as a political body to decide independent of any provision made by Congress, though subject not to conflict with any of them when rightful, who shall compose its population, who become its residents, who its citizens who enjoy the privileges of its laws, and be entitled to their protection and favor, and *what kind of business it will tolerate and protect.*"

In the same cases it was insisted by Daniel Webster, who appeared as counsel for the whiskey men, that prohibitory laws on the part of a state are in conflict with the Constitution of the United States and its revenue laws. Chief Justice Taney and the other Justices promptly met this question, and decided that there was nothing in the Constitution to prevent any state from prohibiting the Liquor Traffic altogether, if it saw proper to do so, that it is purely a matter of police regulation in the sound discretion of the State, to be exercised for the good of its citizens. We make the following extracts from the opinions of some of the Justices. Chief Justice Taney says: "If any state deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice or debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating or restraining the traffic, or from *prohibiting it altogether*, if it thinks proper." Justice Mclean says: "If the foreign article be injurious to the health or morals of the community, a state may, in the exercise of that great and conservative police power, which lies at the foundation of its prosperity, *prohibit the sale of it.* No one

doubts this in relation to infected goods, or licentious publications." Justice Catron says, "I admit as inevitable that if the State has the power of restraint by license to any extent, she has the discretionary power to judge of its limit, and may go to the length of prohibiting sales altogether." The foregoing quotations settle the question as to the power of the State to prohibit the Liquor Traffic. The expediency, and we may add, the necessity of doing so has already been shown.

As well known historical facts we may state that such a law has been in force in the state of Maine for nearly thirty years; such a law is now in force in the state of Kansas; and under the various local option laws, in many localities in other States. And wherever this principle of Prohibition has been invoked peace and good order have prevailed. Let any honest observer note the marked contrast existing between the counties where Prohibition has been inaugurated under the local option law of Texas, and those countries where the license system yet prevails, and he will be convinced that it is better to prevent crime and disorder by law, than to encourage it by an infamous license system. and then attempt to punish offenders, at great expense to the State, and consequent oppressive taxation to its citizens. But liquor sellers and their friends, forced from every position on the field of argument, have resorted to the old maxim, that "a lie well told and often repeated, is as good as the truth;" and through a hireling press keep up the false report, that prohibition does not prohibit, and that as much liquor is sold in Maine and in Kansas as before prohibition. Let us appeal to the best evidence which can be obtained, and ascertain whether these reports are true or false. We are willing that the state of Maine shall be taken as the test of this prohibition policy. If prohibition, after a trial of over a quarter of a century in Maine has proven a failure, then we give it up. But now to the testimony. What do the officials of the state of Maine have to say upon the subject? We quote from that admirable and reliable work "*Alcohol and the State*," by Judge Pittman, of the Superior Court of Massachusetts, the answer of the various officials of the state of Maine, when interrogated as to the operation and efficiency of the Prohibitory Liquor Law in that state.

Statement of Governor Chamberlain:

BRUNSWICK, Maine, June 3, 1872.

"The declaration made by many persons that the Maine law is

inoperative, that liquors are sold freely and in large quantities in this State, is not true. The liquor traffic has been greatly repressed and diminished here and throughout the State, and in many places has been entirely swept away. The law is as well executed generally in the state as other criminal laws are."

Gov. Dingley, in 1874, says:

"We have had twenty-three years' experience of the policy of prohibition, and the results have been, on the whole, so far greater than those secured by any other system of legal restraint that the prohibitory policy is accepted as a settled fact in this state, and no considerable body of men favor its repeal. In more than three-fourths of the state, particularly in the rural sections, open dram-shops are almost unknown, and secret sales comparatively rare."

Gov. Connor, in 1876, says:

"I have no official information to present to you with regard to the working of the laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors. It is a matter of common knowledge that they have been very generally enforced, especially in the cities and large towns, where the traffic is most persistently attempted to be carried on in defiance of them. The law, as a whole, fairly represents the sentiment of the people. The opposition to it presents in appearance a strength which it does not in reality possess. Maine has a fixed conclusion upon this subject. It is that the sale of intoxicating liquors is an evil of such magnitude that the well-being of the state demands, and the conditions of the social compact warrant its suppression."

We will now close the evidence by giving facts shown by the United States census returns of 1870, and the Internal Revenue Reports for 1874, contrasting two states of nearly equal population, the one under the license system and the other with prohibition. I refer to the state of Maine with 626,715 population in 1870, and the state of Maryland with 780,894 population by same census. In 1874 Maine, with nearly as much population, had one distillery against sixty-three in Maryland, three breweries against sixty-five; 843 retailers against 4,285 in Maryland; and paid \$49,000 of liquor revenue, against \$1,285,000 paid by the people of Maryland. This shows whether "Prohibition prohibits," and shows it from authentic sources.

The testimony from Kansas is the same. Gov. St. John has repeatedly stated in answer to inquiries, that while the law is con-

stantly violated in a few large cities, that throughout the remainder of the state, it is as well executed as any other penal statute; and taken altogether is a grand success.

In conclusion, to briefly recapitulate, we have now shown that every Christian citizen is a member of the Civil Government, as well as of the Kingdom of God. That it is not only his privilege, but his duty to have and express a voice in the government, which regulates his life, liberty, and property. That the Liquor Traffic is the most tremendous evil preying on the body politic; that it affects in greater or less degree the person, health, reputation, property and happiness of every citizen. That it is a fit subject matter for the interposition of the power of the state for the protection of society. That such legislation is not incompatible with natural right nor in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. Hence we arrive at the general conclusion that every Christian citizen should vote in every election, but should vote for no candidate for any office who sells or uses intoxicating liquors, and who is not in favor of prohibiting the sale of such liquors, by law.

E. L. DOHONEY.

THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL.

The Theology of the schools of men is remarkable for complexity; the Gospel of Christ for its simplicity. The one is human; the other, divine. The one is error mixed with truth; the other is truth unmixed with error. The one is unintelligible; the other, intelligible. The one is from the earth, earthy; the other, from heaven, heavenly. The acceptance of the former imparts no spiritual life to the soul, but leaves it in doubt, darkness and fear. The acceptance of the latter elevates the soul to the habitation of its author, and fills it with joy unspeakable. The observance of the one brings us to councils and decrees, to schools and systems, to Rome and the Vatican, to Dort and its Synod, to Westminster and its confession. The observance of the other brings us to Mt. Zion, unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels; to the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are enrolled in heaven, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant.

I propose an essay on the *Simplicity of the Gospel of Christ*, and in discussing the subject in all its bearings, I will endeavor to present:

I. Sound arguments in support of the proposition that the Gospel is a plain, simple system of divine truth.

II. To show the corruption of this Simplicity.

III. To indicate the Restoration.

IV. To point out the danger of falling back into corruption.

V. To urge the duty of pleading for the simplicity which is in Christ.

I. ARGUMENTS FOR THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL.

(a). I draw my first argument from the character of Christ. His simplicity was eminent. In deportment, in dress, in look and gesture, in giving and receiving attention, in every movement of mind and body the blessed Savior was the perfection of simplicity.

If we examine this element in human character, we observe that the greater the man the simpler his character. It is true, the world over, and in all past time, whether in the field or cabinet, in the office or pulpit, in the Senate Chamber or Presidential Chair, in the seats of science, or at the tables of polite literature.

Ostentation is the mark of weakness and self-conceit. Pomp and display belong only to inferior minds. Weak men in their efforts to imitate the strong, always attempt to supply a deficiency of mind by the use of sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. Strong men may be compelled by law to wear gowns and military trappings, but all such things are burdensome to them, and they prefer "citizens' dress."

The outer man will express the inner; and just as inferior animals cannot wear a lion's skin without being detected, so the man of inferior intellect, who aspires to the honor of first-class mind, cannot successfully imitate the beautiful simplicity of his superior. He will blow a trumpet, ring a bell, or strike a cymbal.

All the great statesman, all the great jurists, all the great judges, all the great scientists, linguists, mathematicians, of Europe and America, demonstrate the truth of the position that true greatness associates itself with simplicity, and will not keep company, except by constraint, with any member of the pompous family.

In the study of the Savior's character we may easily discover a full exemplification of this principle. He regarded with contempt every exhibition of the haughty Pharisee. He loved communion with the meek and lowly, and pronounced a blessing upon them. He preferred an humble seat by the wayside, conversing with a weary traveller, to the highest seat in a synagogue disputing with a demoralized priest. He never sought celebrity, but rather avoided it. He never attempted to elevate himself above the multitude, so as to court applause, but with simplicity of manner and humility of spirit he went about doing good. He expressly charged the multitudes, who became enthusiastic over his wonderful works, that they should not make him known. And so true was he to his simplicity that, in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah, he did not strive nor cry, neither did any man hear his voice in the street, trumpeting his own fame.

Bringing this wonderful character to our view, let us note a few incidents. He walked to the Jordan, unaccompanied by a grand procession, to be baptized of John. He moves alone to the

mountain and ascends its height to be tempted of Satan. He takes an humble position with his disciples when talking to them about the kingdom of God. He retires from the throng to pour out his soul in prayer to his father. He avoids the admiration of an excited multitude and seeks only the approbation of God.

Such was the simplicity of the Great Teacher. Would we not expect that his teaching would be simple?

With these statements before us we are ready for the next argument:

(b) The second argument for the Simplicity of the Gospel is drawn from the simplicity of the teaching of Christ.

The only way to move the human mind to any purpose, high or low, is by teaching. God has constituted the mind so that it can be influenced to voluntary action by the reception either of truth or error. Moral power is the only power which God has employed to enlighten the masses, and lead them from a lower to a higher degree of knowledge—"from Nature up to Nature's God"—from a low to a high conception of the Supreme Being—from ignorance to intelligence—from absurdity to rationality—from senseless superstition to thoughtful veneration—from wild fanaticism to sober reflection.

The Father of Mercies has ever known the absolute necessity of Education. All the prophets from Moses to Malachi, from John the Baptist at the Jordan to John the Evangelist on the Isle of Patmos, were *teachers*, teachers sent from Heaven.

High above all stands Christ. Let us regard him as a teacher, while we love him as a Savior.

Christ introduced a new school of Divinity. He proposed to abolish altars, and curtains, and candlesticks; robed priests, bullocks and goats; formality and legalism—mint, anise and cumin; and trained his followers to the adoption of a system of "*Spirit and Truth*." The *law* was given by Moses, but *grace and truth* came by Jesus Christ. To present this system of truth to the world he called to his aid a few illiterate men and gave them instruction in order that they might instruct others. Christ rarely addressed a large crowd by his own desire. His leading purpose in the line of instruction was to *teach his apostles*. Seeing the multitudes he went up into the mountain—not inviting the multitudes to follow him, rather preferring that they would allow him the privilege of going up the mountain with his little band of disciples, without

their company. He had private business with them. They were his pupils and he was anxious to teach them. I was trained to suppose that the great multitudes went along with the disciples, and that Christ delivered his "Sermon on the Mount" to about five thousand people. There is nothing especially wicked in such a supposition, but the narrative in Matthew does not sustain it. On the contrary, the opening of the fifth chapter conveys to my mind the impression that he *retired from the multitude*, and ascended the mountain with his few pupils for the purpose of getting away from a crowd of men moved by idle curiosity. Having secured this retiracy, he took a seat in the presence of a few hearers, opened his mouth and taught them those grand principles of truth which have made his name memorable throughout the world. Delivered at first to an audience of less than a hundred, it has been re-delivered, preached for more than eighteen centuries to more than a hundred million of beings of all grades of intelligence. All these millions can understand that sermon. Why? It is so simple, so plain, so intelligible. It came from the lips of the Great Teacher of Simplicity.

Let us follow him to the seaside and give some attention to his parables.

Teaching by parables was his favorite method. It must be understood, however, that a large number of his parables were not understood by the multitude, simply because Christ did not intend that they should understand them. He designed them for his school. The multitude would press upon him, but he was determined they should not comprehend the import of his illustrations. These illustrations were designed exclusively for apostles. Hence the language of the Savior, in the delivery of the parable of the sower, "I speak to them in parables, because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. But blessed are your eyes, my apostles, for they see, and your ears, for they hear." He then proceeds to give a very clear exposition of the parable which he had just uttered, to the apostles, and the whole matter is so plain that the dumbest Pharisee might understand if he could have heard the explanation. "The *intention* of the law is the law," said a great English barrister; and we may say the *intention* of a parable is the parable. The multitude could not see the point. Christ did not develop his intention to a curiosity crowd. He made known the intention only to the apostles. Will any one

say "this was not fair"? I answer, Christ gave the people abundant opportunities to learn and acknowledge that he was the Messiah—the Son of God. He taught them in other forms. The parable was not intended at that time for any others than his own disciples.

We advance then to a consideration of his miracles. Here we find the popular method—rather, I should say, a method adapted to the popular mind, and one with which the Jewish nation had been familiar ever since the appearance of Moses in Egypt.

A miracle is an argument, just that, and nothing more in its influence upon the human mind. A miracle always has a moral terminus, never a supernatural one. Hence, said the Savior, "If you cannot believe me, believe my works."

Nicodemus recognized this principle, and in a single expression gives the whole philosophy of miracles. That one utterance is worth more than all the volumes that have been written for centuries on miraculous conversion, and miraculous sanctification by all the fathers, all the reformers, and all the revivalists. What is it? "Rabbi, we know thou art a *teacher* sent from God; for no man can do these signs that thou doest except God be with him." Teaching by miracle is one of God's excellent methods of instructing the mind, and if it fails, it is because man voluntarily hardens his heart. All the miracles from Moses to Malachi present and defend one grand proposition: "*I am God, and beside me there is none else.*" All the miracles, from Christ in Palestine to Paul in Rome, present and defend one proposition: "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

Divine power alone can perform miracles:

Christ performed miracles:

Therefore he had divine power.

Possessing divine power he was competent to teach God's will.

He taught, and said, "I am the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*."

Shall we accept him and live, or reject him and die?

I desire here to insist that teaching by miracle is one among the simplest and most convincing methods that can be adopted. It is not for man to understand how the miracle is performed, but simply to discover the unanswerable argument of a miracle, and in the case of Christ, the simplest possible way of demonstrating his Messiahship.

The moral advantage of a miracle extends down the ages, and

will terminate only when the gospel system, by God's appointment, is consummated. The same moral force existing and manifested, when a miracle was performed, has existed ever since, and will exist to the end of time. It is God reasoning with man through his servants, entreating man to be reconciled to his Father.

Thus far, then, we have the *Ethics* of the Mount, the *Parable* expounded, and the *Miracle*, all of them showing the beauty of *Simplicity*.

Establishing the divinity of his mission by his works, Christ proceeds to assert the divinity of his person, and to direct the minds of men to himself as the Savior of the world; not by lengthy reasoning, but by simple affirmation. The teacher, sent from God, tested by the severest ordeals known to man, plainly affirms, "I am the bread of life, eat and live: I am the water of life: drink and live; I am the light of the world: walk while you have the light, that darkness overtake you not: While you have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become the sons of light. If any man serve me, him will my Father honor. I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me shall never die. Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

It was an accommodation, not only to the Jewish mind, but to the mind of humanity in all time, that Christ should first demonstrate his Messiahship, and then, with the authority of God, assert his doctrine, and demand allegiance. It is the prerogative of Deity to command; it is the privilege of humanity to obey.

The *Cross*, the *Grave*, the *Resurrection* suspend the teaching of the Master a part of three days. He rises from the dead to review his labor of love for the living. Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets he interpreted to his disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself, and after showing by physical exploration (handling him) that he was indeed the identical being who, but a few days before, had been crucified, he proceeds, "All things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and the Psalms concerning me. *Then opened he their minds* (by TEACHING) that they might understand the Scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved that Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins

should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem: but tarry ye there until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke 24: 45-49.

Thus teaching the things of the Kingdom of God for forty days he organized the *Apostolic Institute* and gave them power in full to *convert* men, to *organize* them into churches, to train them in personal duty, in public worship, discipline and government.

It is fitting that our second argument should close with the commission as given by Matthew and Mark.

"All authority hath been given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I command you, and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that disbelieveth shall be damned."

Having taught his pupils all things concerning the Kingdom, having given them this commission and promising to send them another teacher or advocate to guide them into all truth, the Savior was received up into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God.

CHARACTER AND TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES.

(c) The third argument I present for the Simplicity of the Gospel is drawn from the character and teaching of the apostles.

"I thank thee, O Father," said the Savior, "that thou hast concealed these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes" (simple-minded men).

"It was God's good pleasure," said Paul, "through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." "For behold your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, (have part herein)*; but God chose the foolish things of the world (the apostles) that he might put to shame them that are wise; and God chose the weak things of the world, that he might put to shame the things that are strong; and the base things of the world, and the things that are

* 1 Cor. 1: 26. The ellipsis may be supplied by "call you," or "are called": Either will make sense. The context sustains the former; the plebeianism of the first churches, the latter.

despised did God choose, and the things that are not, that he might bring to nought the things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence." 1 Cor. 1: 26-29.

Still further the apostle declares that he came not with excellences of speech (like Grecian orators) or wisdom (Grecian philosophers), proclaiming to you the mystery of God. Because he was determined to know nothing among them save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. "And my speech," continues he, "and my preaching were not in persuasive words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." 1 Cor. 2: 1-5.

Again, "For our glorying is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in *simplicity* and sincerity of God, not in fleshly wisdom, but in the grace of God, we behaved ourselves in the world, and more abundantly toward you." 2 Cor. 1: 12.

I see that the new version has substituted "holiness" for simplicity, yet retains the latter word in 2 Cor. 11: 3 and other places. The word in the original is the same. The radical meaning of the cognate adjective is *simple, not intricate, uncompounded, unadulterated*, hence, metaphorically, *clear, sound, perfect*.

The radical meaning of the noun is *simplicity, plainness, clearness*, as opposed to *obscurity*; hence also, metaphorically, *purity of mind, frankness of character, holiness*.

It may be that the apostle intended to convey the idea that his entire mental being, intellectual and moral, was remarkable for simplicity. It certainly was. He was simple in morals, manners, thought and diction. If this comprehensive meaning be attached to this term, we have in the passage all that we want, all that we could desire to help us unfold the leading idea of this essay, the *Simplicity of the Gospel*.

This element of character was found in all the apostles. The Master had due respect for this feature of character. He entertained high regard for a babe-like man. He desired his disciples to be like little children in thought, feeling, word and action. He gave special instruction to them on the subject. Thus, "When thou doest thine alms do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, * * * but let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth."

"When thou prayest be not like the hypocrites of a sad countenance, standing in the corners of the streets; but use not vain rep-

etitions; enter thy closet and pray to thy father in secret and he shall reward thee openly"—then follows the Lord's prayer. This prayer was designed especially for the apostles. It is fair to suppose that they obeyed the Master, and during their ministry of some forty or fifty years, they kneeled down daily, every one of them, in some quiet, retired place and prayed that prayer. It was calculated to keep down the spirit of pride, pomp and ostentation, and enable them to preserve that simplicity which is so becoming a minister of the gospel.

The apostles were all natural plebeians except Paul. He was a Jewish aristocrat. But when he was converted he became a Christian plebeian. His aristocracy let down, and he estimated all as the very refuse of the earth that he might win Christ.

Let us now present to view

SPECIMENS OF APOSTOLIC PREACHING.

I bring forward four remarkable examples, viz.: 1. Peter at Jerusalem. 2. Paul at Thessalonica. 3. Paul at Corinth. 4. Paul at Rome. These cases are intended to show the gospel in its relation to the unconverted. Let the reader keep before his mind the idea of simplicity. Turning then to Acts, chap. 2, and reading carefully from verse 22 to 37, we have a model sermon, the first sermon after the ascension of Christ, announcing clearly and distinctly the death, burial and resurrection of Christ for the sins of man. Is not that sermon remarkable for its simplicity? Is there any thing involved in obscurity? Did not Peter succeed in making himself understood by his audience? How many thousands were assembled on that occasion we cannot tell, but we are quite certain that three thousand heard, understood and believed; still further, that believing they were ready to do. Do what? Why, do what Christ had commanded before his ascension—do what the Holy Spirit instituted to be done—do what God required. With a determined will, therefore, they eagerly asked, "Brethren, what shall we do? Our hearts are touched, our judgment is convinced, we see our error, what can we do for our salvation?" This was the right question in the right place, addressed to the right man, the inspired apostle. His answer, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Did they stop to discuss the subject of baptism for the remission of sins? No. Was it ever discussed in that age? No. It

was accepted as a *Divine Finality*. They had no right to discuss it. Was the subject *intricate, involved, compounded*? No. It was the simplest thing that could be uttered. It was God's will.

Because it was simple, the three thousand who accepted it, yielded immediately. They believed in Christ, they repented and they were baptized; and the same day there were added to the original one hundred and twenty those three thousand obedient believers.

Beautiful simplicity! Oh, that men would leave their idols—"idols of the forum"—"idols of the market," and *idols of the pulpit*—and just meet Christ at the entrance of the Holy Place.

But what further do we learn? What did these first converts continue to do? Did they meet to discuss God's eternal decrees? Did they wrangle about sublapsarianism and supralapsarianism? Did they talk about Unitarianism and Trinitarianism? Did they dispute about consubstantiation and transubstantiation? Not at all. It was reserved for "Fathers" and "Reformers" to bring about these discussions. Simple-minded Christians, following simple instructions, "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship in the breaking of bread and the prayers."

The second discourse of Peter, delivered at the Beautiful door, is remarkable for the same simplicity which characterized the sermon on the day of Pentecost. It was a lucid exposition of *Christ*. The people understood him. It was so plain that they comprehended it with the understanding, felt it in the heart, and obeyed its demand with the will. Two thousand were added, making the number five thousand one hundred and twenty.

Our next selection may be called

PAUL AT THESSALONICA.

The following is a brief statement of the record in Acts 17: 1-6. Paul went in unto them according to his custom and reasoned with them in the synagogue, expounding and proving two propositions, viz.: 1. The Christ of the Jewish Scriptures, described by the prophets, was to suffer and rise from the dead.

2. The Jesus whom he preached is the Christ of prophecy.

The expounding and proving was so simple that when Paul exhorted them to turn from their idols, they were ready to obey. They consorted with Paul and Silas. They submitted to the gospel.

A church was soon organized, and the apostle addressed the

brethren at that place two epistles, from the first of which we learn that the gospel came to them in *word* and *power* and the Holy *Spirit* and much assurance; and that they became the ensamples to others in Greece, by the work of faith, the labor of love, and the patience of hope; sounding out the word of the Lord; waiting for the Son of God and suffering for the sake of the Master.

They received the gospel not as the word of man, but as the word of God which was effectual in their conversion and sanctification.

I notice in the next place

PAUL AT CORINTH.

Here he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded Jew and Greek, testifying that Jesus was the Christ. Acts 18:4-5. He declared unto them the gospel—that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures—that he was buried, and that he rose on the third day according to the scriptures. In expounding these facts and presenting them as great truths, the apostle doubtless preached at Corinth, as he did throughout the Roman Empire—the sacrificial death of Jesus for the sins of the world—his resurrection to life, bringing life and immortality to man.

The result of the preaching on that occasion is recorded in Acts 18:8. Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, with his house, believed, and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized.

Paul's method of reasoning was simple and convincing; his exhortation was without deceit, so that he could afterward say "in *simplicity* and sincerity of God I behaved myself."

By this simplicity he commended himself to them. They were persuaded—gave up their idolatry and turned to the Lord.

The last citation is taken from Acts 28:16-31.

PAUL'S TWO YEARS' PREACHING AT ROME.

A brief analysis must suffice. The reader may study it carefully.

1. The apostle expounded to them and testified concerning the Kingdom of God, and taught the things concerning Christ, persuading them that Jesus was the Christ both from the law of Moses and from the prophets.

2. The result was that some believed and doubtless obeyed, and others believed not.

3. Those who believed removed their prejudices and yielded to the force of simple truth.

4. Those who did not believe retained their prejudices and would not have Christ to reign over them.

Thus far, then, we have seen that the gospel in its relation to the world—to sinners—non-converts, is a plain, simple system of divine wisdom; it is Christ on the Cross—in the Grave—on the Throne; it is the moral bearing of the Messiah on man as a sinner; it is the correllation of divine power and human ability.

I proceed to show that the gospel in its relation to the church as unfolded by the apostles, is just as simple. I mean especially the ethical department of the gospel, as it stands related to the character of the Christian. I will take up the narrative precisely in the order already given and notice the instructions given by the same apostles to their converts. Open the book, reader, if you please, and act the Berean:

PETER'S INSTRUCTIONS TO HIS CONVERTS.

Brethren: "God hath granted unto us his precious and exceeding great promises, that through these ye may become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world by lust. Yea, and for this very cause, adding on your part all diligence, in you faith supply virtue; and in your virtue knowledge; and in your knowledge, temperance; and in your temperance, patience; and in your patience, godliness; and in your godliness, love of the brethren; and in your love of the brethren—love. For if these things are yours and abound, they make you to be not idle nor unfruitful with the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. * *

* * If ye do these things ye shall never stumble, for thus shall be richly supplied unto you the entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 1:5-11.

Is it not better to follow these simple directions than follow cunningly devised fables? Is it not better to cultivate these seven graces than to "learn by heart" the seven sacraments of an apostate church? Is it not easier, plainer and more prophetic to "grow in grace and in the knowledge of Christ" than to grow in formality and the knowledge of anti-Christ? Let us now consider

PAUL'S INSTRUCTIONS TO HIS CONVERTS AT THESSALONICA.

"Brethren, we beseech and exhort you that you love one-another; that you study to be quiet and to attend to your business; to work with your own hands, that you walk honestly to those who are without; that you put on the breast-plate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation. We desire you to admonish

the disorderly—encourage the faint-hearted—support the weak, and be long suffering to all—render not evil for evil—rejoice always—pray without ceasing—in everything give thanks—quench not the spirit—prove all things—hold fast that which is good.” 1st and 2d Thess. *passim*.

Reader, are you an illiterate man? Say yes. Now tell me upon honor: Do you not understand everything that the apostle says to these Thessalonian Christians? You do. Then, if you are a Christian, just apply the whole to yourself and read the lesson to your brethren. Still further, thank God that the gospel of his Son can be understood by an uneducated man.

Now let us turn to Paul's letter to the Romans and see what he has to say:—

{ PAUL'S INSTRUCTIONS TO THE ROMAN CHRISTIANS.

Brethren: “God will render to every man according to his work; to them who by patience in well doing seek for glory, honor and incorruption, eternal life; but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, * * * but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good. All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death. We were buried with him, through baptism, into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. * * * Now being made free from sin ye have become servants of righteousness. * * * * *

I beseech you therefore, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God. * * * Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good; be tenderly affectionate one to another; fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing steadfastly in prayer; communicating to the necessities of Saints; given to hospitality. Avenge not yourselves, but give place to wrath. If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst give him drink. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.” Rom. 2d, 6th and 12th chapters.

Thanks be unto God for all his precious gifts—the gift of Christ—the gift of his gospel—the gift of intellect to understand

the gospel—the gift of emotion to feel his goodness—and the gift of Will to obey him.

(d) *Fourth Argument.* The Divine adjustment of the Gospel to the capacity of the Mind, affords an argument for its simplicity.

Scientists tell us about the correllation of physical forces. We believe them, and agree with them in calling the grand display physical correllation. We go a little further than many of these scientists, and attribute the making of these forces to a God of infinite power, wisdom and goodness. God is the author of physical correllation, and God is the author of moral correllation. I use the term moral in its widest sense (in contradistinction to physical,) embracing the whole mind and all its operations.

To show plainly what is meant by moral correllation let us notice a few correllative terms. Here is a short list, viz: father and child; husband and wife; master and servant; teacher and scholar; sovereign and subject. The first name in every couplet implies the second, and conversely, the second implies the first. In the great work of redemption God calls on man for co-operation, and in order to carry out this co-operation, our Maker and Redeemer has kindly ordained that every demand on his part shall find in the human mind a corresponding faculty to meet such demand.

Does God require Faith? Does he utter his word by his prophets that man may believe? Then Man *can believe*, because God has endowed him with the capacity of believing. Man is a believing being, the world over, and in all time. He has been believing something, either truth or falsehood, for about six thousand years; and he will continue thus to believe something till time shall be no more. The Divine Being proposes to educate this faculty and fit it for his own service. Therefore he has sent prophets, apostles and his Son into the world to captivate this dominant organ of the human mind and bring it into subjection to his own will. How? By teaching. By testimony establishing a fundamental truth. The mind grasps it by credenciveness, a God given power to every rational being. The power to believe necessitates some truth to be believed, and some truth uttered by a God inspired prophet or the Son of God necessitates a capacity to believe that truth. And this is what we call moral correllation.

Every command of the Almighty issued by himself or by his

servants finds an appropriate faculty in that most wonderful handiwork of the Creator—*Mind*.

Dost thou, oh God, command me to believe in thy Son? I do believe. Thou wilt not, thou canst not believe for me. Dost thou, O God, command me to repent of my sins? I do repent. Thou canst not repent for me; thou wilt not force me to repent.

Dost thou, Oh God, command me to confess Christ, that he is *thy* Son and *my* Savior? I do confess him with all my heart. Thou canst not confess for me.

Dost thou command me to be baptized for the remission of my sins? I yield to thy command.

I thank thee, Oh Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that thou hast thus wonderfully adapted thy commands to my intellectual and moral nature. Thy word is quick, powerful and credible. Therefore I believe it. Thy word bids me repent; my soul is sorry and turns away from sin. Thy word bids me to be baptized; my will moves me to the liquid grave.

Then thou dost order me to pray. I feel its need—the need of prayer—and I humbly bow before Thee and lift my voice and heart in supplication and praise. Prayer is the want of my soul, and I find in Thee, oh God, the Holy one to whom my petition can be addressed. Blessed be thy Holy name. I could not find Thee, oh my Father, by wisdom or the wisdom of my fellow man. But thy Son has found me, and I have learned of him that thou art God, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin.

A very short analysis of Faith, showing its power upon the human soul, will strengthen this argument:

Man is the subject of Faith; in other words, Man is the believer.

Christ is the object of Faith; the being in whom Man believes.

Testimony is the ground of Faith.

Desire of Life is the motive of Faith.

Obedience is the influence of Faith.

Salvation is the effect of Faith.

It is not necessary that any one should have so clear an understanding of this arrangement as to talk on the philosophy of faith; but, let it be observed, that every true believer in Christ is an exemplification of the process by which Faith, as a cause, working by love and purifying the heart, reaches its effect—the salvation of the soul.

A *true Christian Rationalism* asserts fearlessly the doctrine of mediate spiritual influence; contending that man by birth and nature is not totally depraved, but may become so by habit. It defends the apostolic thesis. Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. It humbly acknowledges its inability to *devise a plan* of salvation, but rejoices in the moral ability possessed by the mind to *accept the plan* of Christ. It sits with Mary at the Master's feet, and learns wisdom from his lips. It communes with Peter as he discourses to the Jews on Pentecost; with Paul as he reasons concerning the Christ at Thessalonica. It will not consent to be *passive*; but thinks, feels, and wills as God *by his spirit in the apostles*, gives directions. It conceives that the grace of God has appeared unto all men in the proclamation of the gospel; that the gospel is *the grace* of God, and *the power* of God unto salvation to all who receive the engrafted word. It is, in fine, *reason* not proudly nor arrogantly discarding the help of revelation—but *reason hearing* God speak—*reason* believing the things spoken of God—*reason* invoking the affections to so love God as to prefer his service to the dominion of lust—*reason* invoking the will to serve him whose right it is to reign.*

(e) I now proceed to consider *The Fifth Argument*, which, for brevity, may be styled

THE SIMPLICITY OF WORSHIP.

Man is a worshipping being. His mental constitution fits him for worship. The intuitive faculties will direct him to worship an "unknown God," or "Gods many and Lords many." It may be that the unknown God is invested with Power, Wisdom and Goodness. The ideal God of Socrates approaches very near the true and living God of the Jew and Christian, and that great old philosopher might be regarded as a tolerably respectable monotheist, but for the remarkable fact that he proposed on a certain solemn occasion to sacrifice a cock to Æsculapius. Socrates needed a teacher—one sent from God to guide his monotheistic mind in the way of truth.

* NOTE.—I have taken a few paragraphs from two essays which I published some ten years ago in the *Christian Quarterly*. An author has a right to his own property, and I make no quotation marks. It is proper, however, that I should publish this note lest I might be charged with literary theft. My name did not appear to either of these articles, appearing only in the Index.

All the attempts made by man in every age of the world to worship God without the guidance of inspiration have been feeble and insignificant compared with the worship of the enlightened Christian who approaches God, through Christ, by the direction of the Spirit. I do not say that all such attempts have been failures in every case. On the contrary, I am deeply impressed with the conviction that the Father of mercies will hear the earnest cry of the benighted one who "ignorantly worships" in a land where the Sun of Righteousness has never shone.

It is impossible to worship God in "Spirit and in Truth" without coming to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ. No responsible man can come unto the Father in any way whatever, but by the Son. And as the sinner cannot approach God but by complying with the word of Christ, so the Christian cannot approach God in worship except by submission to the law of worship prescribed by Christ.

This law was doubtless given to the apostles during the forty days' tuition. They gave it to the churches, and we have no other way of ascertaining the elements of worship, learning the code of worship, but by consulting the book which contains an account of the transactions of the apostles, and the letters which they wrote to the churches of the first century.

The multiform methods of worshipping God by monotheists adopted in our age show the necessity of a standard; assuredly that standard should be divine. I cannot trust myself, and I will not trust any fallible man, or congregation of men on so important a question, How shall I worship God?

Let us take a survey of the monotheists of the nineteenth century: 1. Catholics. 2. Protestants. 3. Mohammedans. 4. Deists. 5. Jews. All of these great families worship one God, but with wonderful variations. These variations are as widely divergent as the contradictory schools from which they emanate, and the scientific evolutionist looks on, laughs at the depravity of human intellect, and the waywardness of human emotion—turns away in disgust, and says in his heart, "There is no God."

"Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift," the gift of Christ—Christ the sin offering, the Priest, the King, the *Teacher*.

No intelligent Christian can hesitate to believe that the Savior gave instructions to his apostles after his resurrection in reference to the worship of God, although we have no account of the details of

that instruction as it came from the lips of the instructor. If, at any time, they forgot the instruction the Spirit brought it to their minds.

From the sources indicated we learn the following facts:

1. The Disciples came together on the first day of the week.
2. They engaged in supplication, giving of thanks and prayers.

3. They sang psalms, hymns and spiritual songs.

4. They partook of the Lord's supper.

5. They made monied contributions for the poor.

Accompanying these acts of devotion and contributing thereto, they searched the scriptures—read from the prophets and the Psalms, and also read the letters written to them by the apostles.

The Bishops of the congregations delivered exhortations, and the apostles and evangelists preached the word of the Lord.

This system of worship emanating from a divine source is remarkable for its unity, intelligibility and adaptation to the mind. It expresses dependence and want on the part of man—authority and goodness on the part of God. It educates the emotional nature. It eliminates impurity from the heart. It keeps the soul near to God. It speaks to the world and says, "Behold the simplicity and Divinity of true worship." It places the moral above the intellectual. Paul disputing with the Epicureans and Stoics in the capitol of Greece was a grand man; but a grander man was he when he kneeled down on the sea shore at Miletus and poured out his soul to God in prayer with the weeping bishops of Ephesus around him.

Let us pray without ceasing; in everything give thanks, and through Christ offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our life which makes confession to his name.

Let no human wisdom entice us from the simple worship authorized by the gospel of Christ.

(f) *The Sixth Argument* for the Simplicity of the Gospel is based upon the Simplicity of the Ceremonial Ordinances. These are three, namely: 1st. Baptism. 2d. Lord's Supper, and 3d. Manual Ordination.

Learned discussions on Baptism are complicated and wonderful; and how passing wonderful are the minds of ingenious men who write volumes on sprinkling, pouring, purifying, and using the smallest quantity of water possible. What a Babel of Hebrew,

Greek, and Latin has been constructed to involve the subject in mystery and myth! Are not all these productions philological dreams? The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream, and he that hath my word, saith the Lord, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? What hath the Lord spoken? He hath spoken on this subject by his own mouth and by the mouth of the apostles, as follows:

He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved. Mark 16:16.

Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Acts 2:38.

All we, who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death, that, like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. Rom. 6:3-5.

In him (Christ) ye are complete—having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. Col. 2:12

Baptism doth now save you, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. 1 Peter 3:21-22.

Such is the simple teaching of the word of God on this ordinance. If the theological artists would let it alone—let it speak for itself—show it in its own true color, and avoid or abstain from painting it according to the rules of their masters, ancient medieval or modern, the world might see the beauty of simplicity as exhibited in a burial with Christ.

Let us notice, for a few moments, the sacred simplicity of

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Every ceremonial ordinance of the gospel is expressive of divine truth. Here is the outward and the inward—the external and the internal—the visible and the invisible. The outward, the external, and the visible are appreciated by the external senses; the inward, the internal and the invisible can be appreciated only by the internal faculties of the mind. The mere *matter* and the physical action of an ordinance are of no avail without the spirit and moral action. The spirit and truth must accompany form, or we fail to obtain a blessing.

In Baptism water is the *matter*, and burial in water is the ac-

tion. The interrogation of a good conscience is the spirit and truth. Remission of sins is the blessing.

In the Lord's Supper, Bread and Wine constitute the *matter*. Eating and drinking, the action. Communion of the body and blood of Christ is the spirit and truth, and growth in grace is the blessing.

Intuition has no play in any ceremonial ordinance of heaven. Human wisdom, unaided by inspiration, sees no necessary propriety in water, bread or wine; but human wisdom, guided by inspiration, accepts the form, and adopts it as the method of divine will.

Coming then to inspiration for instruction we learn that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said: "This is my body which is for you; this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also, the cup, after supper (paschal), saying: This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body. 1 Cor. xi:23-29.

These directions of an inspired teacher are remarkably plain. They are clear and intelligible. They enable us to eliminate all the mystery which man has thrown into the institution, and discover the truth first uttered by the Master and afterwards published by the apostles.

The proper observance of the Lord's Supper involves every department of the mind. The humble recipient thinks of Christ, loves him and sympathizes with him. He says, too, "Lord, I will do thy will." The institution contemplates the past, the present and the future; pointing to Calvary and the Crucified—to the communion of saints and to the promise "I will come again and take you to myself." Faith fills the head; Love, the heart, and hope inspires both. The ordinance is full of meaning. It means the compassion of God; the suffering of Christ; the sinfulness of man; the rich promise of mercy by the shedding of blood; the obligation of the saint to his Savior. It means spiritual life in Christ, and the mighty expectation that when Christ, who is our

life, shall appear, we shall appear with him in glory. Thanks be unto God for the simplicity of the Lord's Supper.

I notice briefly in the next place

MANUAL ORDINATION.

The process of setting apart a Bishop, Deacon, or Evangelist, by prayer, fasting and imposition of hands is prescribed in the *New Testament*. According to the apostolic method there is no pomp or pride in the matter, but the ceremony is just as simple as the other two institutions to which I have alluded.

Wealth, luxury, vanity and ecclesiastic aristocracy have combined to invest it with mystery and exclusiveness; but the constitution of the Church (*N. T.*) gives no countenance to any of these eccentricities. An impartial examination of its promises will lead to the following rules and regulations:

The ordaining power is the congregation under Christ. The candidate to be ordained should be a man qualified for his work by piety and a knowledge of the scriptures. In other words, by possessing the traits of character prescribed by an apostle of Christ. The person or persons imposing hands should be God-fearing men, appointed by the congregation—whether visiting brethren or resident ministers.

No spiritual gift is imparted. No grace flows from the fingers of an uninspired man. The silent language of an ordination is this: "By this voluntary act, we, the congregation, publicly and in the presence of heaven, recognize you, the ordained one, as our servant and the servant of the Lord. Do your duty and God will reward you."

The responsive utterance of the ordained minister is: "By this voluntary act, kneeling in the presence of God, and with you, my brethren, and receiving the imposition of hands upon my head bowed in prayer, I take upon myself the charge which you have committed to me. May God enable me to perform my duty; and I pray that you may assist me in the discharge of my obligations." And let all the people say, Amen.

(g) The Seventh and last argument I present for the Simplicity of the Gospel is found in the simplicity of Church Government.

The maxim that all just powers in government are derived from the consent of the governed may do for a human republic,

but as relates to the church of God, it is utterly subversive of sound truth, propriety and order.

As well may we adopt that dangerous principle, "*Vox Populi, Vox Dei.*" As a general thing *Vox Populi, Vox Diaboli*. No man, acquainted with history, will deny it. Majorities are as often wrong as right. Man does not know how to govern himself. He needs an all-wise power to guide him. Happy is that nation whose God is the Lord, or, by transposition, whose Lord is God.

The essential principles of church government may be expressed in a few plain propositions:

1. Church government must be compatible with God's attributes.
2. It must harmonize with the divine method of converting the world and sanctifying the church.
3. It must harmonize with the great principle that Christ is the Head of the church.
4. It must harmonize with the principle that the church is a sanctified body—separate from the world—separate from the State.
5. It must be regulated by the laws of the King in Zion.
6. It must adopt the Bible as its constitution without any amendment or supplement made by converts.
7. The officers must be selected according to the prescriptions of divine law.
8. The jurisdiction of officers must be determined by the constitution.
9. All the procedures of the church, such as missions, schools, and conventions, must be regulated by the fundamental law—the edict of God—that Christ is Legislator—the apostles, Judges—and the Church, by its officers, the executive branch of the government.

With these principles before us—drawn from the word of God—we fail to discover a true government in the monarchy of Papalism, the Prelacy of Anglicanism, or the Democracy of Congregationalism. The first is absoluteism; the second, sacerdotalism; and the third, agrarianism; administered respectively by despots, aristocrats, and majorities. They are all unsafe, unreliable. They are all moved by whim and caprice, contradicting their own judgments, and reversing their own decrees.

What then is the true church government, and how may it be named? I answer, by the guidance of Paul, a servant of the Lord.

CONGREGATIONAL EPISCOPACY.

Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you Bishops (overseers) to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Acts 20:28.

Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, to all the saints in Christ which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons. Philippians 1:1.

The Bishop must be without reproach, sober minded, orderly, apt to teach. * * * * one that ruleth well his own house (for if he knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?) 1st Tim. 3:2-6.

Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in word and teaching. 1 Tim. 5:17.

For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint Elders in every city, if any be blameless, &c. For the Bishop must be blameless, &c. Titus 5:7.

The Elders who are among you I exhort. * * * Feed the flock of God, exercising the oversight (rulership), not of constraint, but willingly according unto God. * * * Neither lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. 1 Peter 5:1-3.

If a christian father is *bishop* of his family, and he govern according to the word of God, does he call upon his children to carry measures by a majority?

If the Superintendent—overseer of a Sunday School—is bishop of that school, and he calls around him experienced teachers to aid him in his government, does he need the votes of inexperienced children to enable him to govern his school?

If the teaching Bishop of a congregation, in association with co-Presbyters, is a God appointed ruler, why should he call upon inexperienced men, women and children to vote upon the vital interests of the church?

Congregational Episcopacy is the simplest and purest government on earth. Prescribed by the Spirit of God and enforced by the apostles, it commends itself to every intelligent mind—to every adoring heart. There is no arbitrary power in its administration. If a Bishop become arbitrary he simply becomes wicked, and forfeits his right to the office. The congregation which selects him,

as children select a guardian in court, have the undoubted right to deprive him of his office.

We need good men, wise men, liberal minded men, not avaricious men, temperate men, not wine bibbers, ensamples to the flock to rule in the fear of God, and by his holy law. Let the rulers rule, and let the people say, Amen.

Paul's instructions establish this form of government. The analogy of the Jewish theocracy sustain it. Sanctified common sense approves it, and the mortifying failures of the "Majority rule" enforce it. The honor and dignity of our sacred profession demand it, and the wide-spread demoralization of Christian Churches in America cries aloud from the moral chaos, and urges its necessity.

What shall we say of *co-operation*? Why, it is simply *grand*. Isolation is weakness; combination is power. Let churches, by counties, and by states, associate—not to enact arbitrary decrees, and play the role of court in bank—but to sound out the word of the Lord. What are the results? Missions, Sunday Schools, Charities, and all things of honest and good report. Oh, Sacred Simplicity! Thou art a Jewel.

I must defer the discussion of other matters to another number.

WM. J. BARBEE.

POPULAR LITERATURE AND PUBLIC MORALS.

Books contain words, words convey ideas, ideas control actions and actions determine the quality and destiny of souls. Books classify ideas, ideas classify conduct, and conduct classifies men. One man is better than another because his conduct is better; his conduct is better because his thoughts are better, and his thoughts are better because his literature is better.

Herein do we see the true theory of the transmigration of souls. Licentious souls transmigrate, through the medium of obscene literature, to the readers of such literature. And the upright in heart impress their purity upon the world through the medium of their writings. The understanding and sympathetic reader cannot but take on the nature of the writer. Every volume is full of the seed principles of righteousness or iniquity. Books affect the heart no less than the head. Literature is but a magazine of moral and intellectual forces through which the thoughts and motives of writers are communicated to the heads and hearts of readers. From the first the world has understood how thoughts are communicated through books; but the moral forces and capabilities of literature have not been so fully comprehended.

The doctrine of the New Testament as to the spirit's *modus operandi*, preached in modern times by the pioneers of the current Restoration, is the only true theory of the morality and spirituality of literature. According to this theory, external objects, through the medium of the corporeal senses, make pictures in the mind. It is especially the office of the imagination, as its name implies, to finish off such images as external objects may suggest. Such images constitute the idols of the soul and the models of life. Memory retains them for the heart to adore and the life to copy. In this sense, we understand, God is in the hearts of His people—a fact so frequently stated in the Bible, yet so little understood by the world. Every man of sound mind has a god of some kind in his heart. That god receives the adoration and models the action of the soul.

If it be an imperfect god, therefore, its devotee can never attain unto the stature of a perfect man. And the imperfections of the worshiper will always be found to agree with the defects of the worshipped. The life of every rational man is of necessity like the god in his heart. Hence we are in God and God is in us. God is in us in that our hearts are conformed to the divine nature, and we are in God in so far as our life is God manifest in the flesh. Members of the church are ungodly in life only when they have not God in the heart. It is difficult to conceive how a man with God in his heart can be ungodly in life; for the conduct of men is but the manifestation of what is in their hearts. Hence it is said: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." ¹ John 3:9. If man had no volition as to the reception of God into his heart, he would have absolutely no control over his conduct. And if one had not the power to eject God from the heart, apostasy would be impossible. So long as God rules the heart, man is not sovereign of his own conduct. But the sovereignty of man over his own conduct is conclusively argued from his power to receive God into, or eject him from, his heart.

The gods of the heart are not indigenous there. They do not spring up spontaneously from within, irrespective of teaching and association. By the simple process of inductive reasoning it may be established beyond cavil or dispute that the gods always reach the heart through the medium of the understanding. It is this fact that gives importance to the influence of books over the soul. The mind has all the faculties necessary to make its own gods, of the material admitted through the senses. The quality of the material addressed to the mind always determines, therefore, the nature of the gods enthroned in the heart. If obscene matter be addressed to the understanding, the mind will set up gods of lusts in the heart, to receive the devotion and model the action of the soul. But if pure matter engage the mind, the soul will esteem and practice virtue rather than vice.

It thus appears that God has wisely respected the nature and laws of the human constitution in inditing the Bible, to mould the character and control the conduct of men. Understanding that, in the nature of things, gods, whether good or bad, true or false, could reach the human heart only through the understanding, He has caused to be written down in the Bible the adorable principles

of love, mercy, wisdom, power and justice, and has left the natural faculties of man to comprehend and worship the personification of these great principles of universal sovereignty. Do not understand me to say these abstract principles constitute the material out of which an ingenious imagination has made the Christian's God. I merely state that these principles, the revealed attributes of Jehovah, are all that we can comprehend, appreciate, or worship, of the true God, while we are burdened with the flesh. In a higher sphere, I doubt not, other revelations will be made, as we are able to receive them. But while we continue in the flesh what has been revealed must be received as the maximum limit of things needful or knowable. These revealed attributes dwelling in the heart and tempering the life here will prepare us for grander revelations of the glory of God hereafter. "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known."

These principles explain why the lines of moral distinction are always formed parallel with those of literary criticism. A good judge of men and books can always tell, from the moral tone of a volume, what kind of men will be most eager to read it. News-dealers never purchase Bibles for scandal-mongers, nor Ingersoll's lectures for virtue-lovers. Such a mistake is never committed by a man with an eye for business. The reason men of corrupt hearts prefer obscene literature is one of the simplest principles of moral philosophy.

The pleasure derived from a volume is in direct proportion to the sympathy between reader and writer. Infidels find no pleasure in reading the Bible for the same reason that Christians are not entranced by atheistic literature. The reason in both cases is lack of congeniality between reader and writer. The same principle obtains in the selection of books that regulate friendships and associations among men. A man of groveling mind selects immoral literature on the same principle that he associates with degraded people. Such literature and associates conduce to his happiness because he is in perfect concord with them. It is as certainly an evidence of moral depravity in a man for his library to be filled with obscene literature as his parlors to be crowded with licentious people.

It is the experience and observation of all men that the things which corrupt the soul, also develop a taste for things corrupting,

while those things which purify the heart, strengthen a taste for things ennobling. So that, if man would become good, he must give his heart to meditate upon good things. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any praise, *think on these things*. Phil. 4:8. The heart is purified and the soul is made to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, by thus thinking—*constantly meditating*—upon things pure, true, just, honest and lovely. He is wise, therefore, who by meditation and constant virtue attunes his heart to the words of inspiration. It is a sure sign of spiritual decadence for one to lose all pleasure in the Book of God. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful; but his delight is in the law of the Lord, *and in His Law doth he meditate day and night*." Ps. 7:1-2.

We trust the reader can now see that, as respects influence upon the morals of a community, a news-stand can be better than a temperance society or worse than a grog-shop. Such stands are always and of necessity radiating centres of moral forces and incentives for good or evil. And while philanthropists are not agreed as to the propriety of legislative prohibition of the production and sale of immoral literature, no one can doubt the wisdom of plying the public conscience with moral suasion against the corrupting trash so profusely circulated among the youth of our country. But in all cases where conscience is appealed to, to restrain vice and encourage virtue, the mind must have clear conceptions of right principles. Conscience can be relied upon only to enforce honest convictions. This much it will endeavor to do whether honest convictions are right or wrong. It therefore becomes necessary to help the public mind to discriminate between moral and immoral literature.

The line of demarkation here is not parallel with that between truth and fiction. Those critics are not to be heard who condemn all fiction and commend all truth in books and periodicals. Truth is often worse than fiction. There is no better way to excite lust in the imagination and foster iniquity in the heart than by studying books and pictures true to facts in the sinks of moral depravity. A fictitious, but not immoral, story is less harmful in men or books

than a true history of a corrupt heart. A not over-drawn picture of virtue and moral integrity, even though it be fiction, may do good by way of purifying the imagination and increasing love for the beautiful in morals. But a picture of great degradation, even though it be true to the facts of history, cannot but make an unwholesome impression upon every emotional reader. The reading of fiction is not to be justified on the ground of literary style. If a book be immoral in tone one can no more read it for the beauty of its style and the elegance of its language than he can associate with gamblers and harlots for the splendor of their costumes and the brilliancy of their conversational powers. I need not say that bad people as often possess the good qualities of dress and language and manners, as do immoral books excel in literary style. The reading of both truth and fiction should be regulated according to principles of morality.

The argument that both good and evil should be written down and illustrated in books so that readers, by contrast, could the more appreciate the one and condemn the other, should be modestly put and cautiously received. While it is not without plausibility, it may be but a skillful piece of sophistry, all the more dangerous because difficult to expose. The argument is based upon the assumption that correct ideas of vice and virtue are formed from comparisons. The assumption is far from satisfactory to my mind. It is rather my opinion that the law of the Lord will enable one to follow that which is right without contrast or comparison. But if it be necessary to base our ideas of vice and virtue upon comparison, the contrast ought to be drawn with great dispatch. The man who cannot see the contrast without going through a whole library of mongrel literature is not blessed with quick moral perception. And if he linger long in the comparison, his taste and imagination will be too much vitiated by the work to profit by the result. When the imagination once forms an image of lust for the heart to worship the ruin of a soul is well-nigh accomplished. A man can no more keep a pure heart with a lascivious imagination than a rose can impart fragrance to a pig-sty.

The morality of men and books must be estimated according to the same criterion. If a book or periodical contain that which good people refuse to associate with in men, consistency forbids that it be read. If men can read such literature as the *Police Gazette* without harm, they can visit the sinks described and associate

with the people photographed in that infamous sheet without injury. If society has no law against the reading of corrupt literature, it is a farce to ostracise those who habituate the dens of iniquity. It has already been shown that the same principle obtains in the selection of both books and associates. And the man who can enjoy reading the lascivious sheets so profusely circulated in this age, is, in all respects, in a proper condition of heart to indulge in the licentiousness they describe. Society, to be consistent, must ostracise the impure book and its readers with the immoral man and his associates. The sooner this point of consistency is insisted upon by good society, the better it will be for the cause of public morality.

It is a fact of no credit to the better element in society, that few of our news-stands and book-stores are entirely free from objectionable literature. For this, news-dealers are censurable in part, but not mainly. The men behind the counter do less to run the establishment than those in front of it. While I do not hold the vendor of corrupt literature blameless, I charge it directly upon the good people of the country that we have so few news-stands that are strictly pure. If the better element in society would peremptorily refuse to patronize mongrel establishments, business men would establish strictly moral news-depots for their accommodation. We have no such houses now, simply because, as yet, there has been no demand for them. Preachers and church members encourage the sale of corrupt literature by patronizing men who deal in it. If good people would withdraw their patronage from all mongrel establishments, book-sellers would at once be compelled to choose between good and evil in the matter of customers as well as stock. Immoral establishments could then be pointed out as things to be loathed and shunned by all pure-minded people. And in that state of things the question of legislative interference against immoral literature could be fairly debated and wisely settled. I put it before all men, who purchase books, as a plain question of moral duty, that they peremptorily refuse to patronize mongrel establishments. And I suggest it as a part of the duty of every good man to interest himself in the establishment of a pure book-store in his community. Let a demand be made with earnestness and emphasis for a pure literature. Preachers especially can perform a solemn duty and accomplish great good by giving attention to the literature of their respective communities in the way sug-

gested. And as for those who engage in the publication and sale of immoral literature, but one opinion can be entertained concerning the sinfulness of their calling. Many of them, I know, are professed Christians, and not a few of them are sinning "ignorantly in unbelief." They are not all aware of their offense against society, yet it is none the less grave. Those who aid in the publication and distribution of corrupt books are little better in occupation, however honest in purpose and pure in motives, than the managers of the dens of iniquity advertised in such literature. There is little choice between managing a circus and posting its bills so far as the morals of the occupation are concerned. In no case can I hold the man blameless who engages to sell, or in any way deal in, corrupt literature. In the estimation of the Jews the Prodigal Son was lost to every sense of honor when he went and joined himself to a citizen of the country to feed swine; but his occupation was much to be preferred to that of the man who joins himself to unconscionable publishers, to feed their groveling crowds of obscene-book-lovers. Good men should never suffer themselves to be tempted by the hope of gain into an occupation so damaging to public morals and offensive to good society. Be it distinctly understood that where men will not buy good books good men cannot sell books.

F. D. SRYGLEY.

THE APOSTLESHIP VS. APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

Ἀπόστολος means one sent, or, perhaps better, one called and sent forth on a special mission.

1. CHRIST THE APOSTLE OF GOD.

Jesus Christ is the Apostle of the Father, and hence Paul says: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him that *appointed* him. Heb. 3: 1.

He was the "sent" of God. The appointing power or authority was God's. He sent Him on a grand mission to this world. God alone had the power to commission His Son as an Apostle to our race. Hence it follows that Christ, as God's Apostle, could have no successor, and every claim looking in that direction, is unfounded and presumptuous; a usurpation of the divine prerogative, identifying the usurper with the "man of sin," who, "sitting in the temple of God," claims to be the "vicegerent" of Christ on earth; and to hold the "keys of the kingdom of heaven."

2. APOSTLES OF CHURCHES.

Barnabas was not an Apostle of Christ, but of the congregation at Antioch. Acts 13: 1-5. He was one of the "prophets and teachers" in the church at Antioch. "And as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed unto Seleucia, and from thence they sailed to Cyprus. And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews; and they had also John to their minister." In this case the Spirit commanded the separation of Barnabas and Saul for a special work, but Christ had previously called Saul of Tarsus, and commissioned him as an Apostle; and Luke, Acts 14: 14, speaks of both Barnabas and Saul as Apostles, but clearly, not in the same sense, as will appear hereafter. Paul, as he was

afterwards called, was already an Apostle in the higher sense of that word, but not so with Barnabas. He, (and Saul also in this case), was separated by the direction of the Holy Spirit for the special work to which the Spirit had called him. And when they had fasted, prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. Both Barnabas and Saul were sent forth by the Holy Spirit and the Church; and there is no intimation that they ever had any successors, nor, indeed, could they have had any unless separated by direction of the Holy Spirit, and sent forth by the Church at Antioch, as the appointing power must be the same in successors as in predecessors.

3. THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST.

(1) *The Apostles were personally called to the Apostolic office.* See Math. x:1-10. Mark iii:13-19. Luke ix:1-6. They did not choose Christ, but were chosen and called by Christ. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" John vi:70. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." John xv:16. "I have chosen you out of the world." John xv:10.

No one could be an Apostle of Christ unless *personally* called and chosen by Him. This statement is true of all the Apostles, as will be clearly seen hereafter. The appointment of Matthias to fill the place of Judas, appears, at first sight, to conflict with the above declaration; but, before closing this article, I think I shall be able to show a complete harmony. As God sent his Son, and the Son called, commissioned and sent the Apostles, the appointing power being invested in Him alone, it follows undeniably that they could have no successors unless specially called and sent out by Him.

(2) *The Apostles of Christ were chosen in Him, and predestinated before the foundation of the world.* Eph. i:7-12.

This chapter begins: "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints who are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus: Grace be to *you* (faithful saints), and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed *us* (the Apostles) with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ: According as He hath chosen *us* (the Apostles) in Him before the foundation of the world, that *we* (the Apostles) should be holy and without blame before Him in love: Having predestinated *us* (the Apostles) unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of

the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made *us* (the Apostles) accepted in the Beloved; In whom *we* (the Apostles) have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace; wherein He hath abounded toward *us* (the Apostles) in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto *us* (the Apostles) the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in Him: in whom also *we* (the Apostles) have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will; that *we* (the Apostles) should be to the praise of His glory, who **FIRST** trusted in Christ. In whom *you* (faithful saints) also trusted, *after* that *ye* heard the word of truth the gospel of *your* salvation: in whom also, *after* that *ye* believed, *ye* were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise."

No one, I think, can read the above paragraph without coming to the conclusion that, from the first to the twelfth verses, Paul is speaking of himself and his co-Apostles; and that at the 13th verse he changes the pronouns "*we*" and "*us*" into "*ye*" and "*your*," addressing himself "to the saints at Ephesus," and to "the faithful in Christ Jesus."

Καταβάλλω is from *κατά* and *βάλλω*, to cast down, (Rev. xii:10) to prostrate. 2 Cor. iv:9, *mid. voice*, to lay down, to lay a foundation. Heb. vi:1. *Καταβολή* is properly a casting down. The phrase "before the foundation of the world," *κόσμος*, not the earth indicates the time when the Apostles, in the purpose of God, were chosen in Christ. This was done "according to the good pleasure of His will," "which He had purposed in Himself." This casting down evidently refers to the Fall of Man, and not to the earth; but to the *κόσμος*, an arrangement of things upon the earth. The world was cast down, made prostrate, subjected to vanity. Christ is spoken of as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. xiii:8. He was slain typically from the casting down of the world, and not in fact. In the *purpose* of God He was slain, and the Apostles were chosen in Him before the casting down of the world.

This view of the subject throws much light on several passages, which have been perverted by Calvinists; but it is not my pur-

pose to examine them now, as they do not lie directly in my line of thought touching the question before me.

I claim, then, that all the apostles of our Lord were chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world, and in God's purpose predestinated to the Apostolic office.

This being true, they could have no successors in office, unless it can be shown that their successors, also, to the end of the ages, were chosen in Christ "before the foundation of the world." But the truth is, the word of God makes no provisions for any succession in the Apostleship, and in the very nature of the case there can be none.

(3) *It was necessary to the Apostleship that the person appointed should have seen Jesus after He arose from the dead.*

All who had seen Christ after He arose from the dead were not Apostles, but no one could be an Apostle unless he had seen Him. Luke says: "For as much as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word," &c. Luke 1:1-2.

The Apostles were "eye-witnesses from the beginning." Peter says: "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that He was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection." Acts 1:21-22.

No one, therefore, could fill the Apostolic office who had not seen the Lord Jesus after He arose from the dead. Matthias had been with the Apostles "beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that He was taken up" into heaven. This was an indispensable qualification for the Apostleship. No one, failing in this qualification, could fill the place of Judas who by transgression fell from this office. Without this qualification no one ever did or could be a successor of any Apostle, since the death of the Apostle John.

(4) *The Apostles were chosen as witnesses.*

They were "eye-witnesses"—witnesses of *facts*, and not vague reports. To bear testimony to what they *saw* and *heard* was their chief and most important work. Jesus Himself, said: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you;

and ye shall be *witnesses* unto Me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Acts 1:8.

Again: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof *we all are witnesses.*" Acts ii:32. Again: "And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses." Acts iii:15. "For we cannot but speak the things which we have *seen and heard.*" Acts iv:20. "And with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." (v:33) "And we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey Him." Acts v:32. "Him God raised up the third day and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto *witnesses* chosen before of God, even to us, *who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead.*" "And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem," &c. Acts x:39-41. When Christ appeared to Saul on his way to Damascus, He appeared to him "to make him a minister and a *witness* both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee." Paul was one of the witnesses of the resurrection of Christ. Acts xxvi:16-18. Ananias said to Saul: "The God of our fathers has chosen thee, that thou shouldst know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of His mouth. For thou shalt be His witness unto all men, of what thou hast seen and heard." Acts xxii:14-15.

With reference to Paul's Apostleship I quote the following: "Am I not an Apostle? am I not free? *have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?*" 1 Cor. ix:1. Paul certainly appeals to the fact of his having seen Christ, in proof of his Apostleship.

Witnesses to facts which they saw and heard can not possibly have any successors. A witness to the miracles, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, in the very nature of the case, is alone qualified to testify as to their truth. The Apostles were all witnesses to these facts. Thomas was incredulous, and said: "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe." John xx:25. And John writes: "That which was from the beginning, which we have *heard*, which we have *seen with our eyes*, which we have *looked upon*, and our hands have *handled* of the Word of life." 1 John 1:1.

Such witnesses never had, and never can have any successors.

(5) *The Apostles were Ambassadors of Christ.*

God in Christ committed (or put in them) unto them the word of reconciliation. "Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." 2 Cor. v:19-20.

They were invested with plenary power, and authorized to act in "Christ's stead." Jesus said to them: "He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that heareth Me, heareth him that sent Me."

Christ said to Peter: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matth. xvi:19. And He said to all the Apostles: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Matth. xviii:18.

He said to them: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John xx:23.

Their preaching and teaching were infallible. They made no mistakes, because they were inspired, and spake as the Spirit gave them utterance.

The last living ambassador was the Apostle John. In him and the other Apostles met all the qualifications for the Apostleship, and no one since his death has possessed any one of them! Ambassadors from one government to another, do not appoint their successors. The absurdity of this must be apparent to all. The Apostles had the power of imparting the Holy Spirit, or Spiritual gifts, by the imposition or laying on of hands. The Apostleship is not hereditary. Ordinal succession, even could it be historically established, cannot make an Apostle. Ordinal succession is like Baptismal succession, a thing which cannot be established. If either one ever existed, it has been lost in the uncertainty and confusion of the dark ages.

(6) *The Apostleship of Matthias: The Twelve.*

Judas is the only Apostle who ever had a successor. He lost his Apostleship by transgression. His successor, unlike the other Apostles, was chosen by lot; and for this reason some have expressed doubt as to his Apostleship, and have advocated the

position that Paul was numbered with the twelve Apostles. This position is untenable, for the following reasons:

(a) The eleven Apostles (with others) were assembled in an "upper room" in Jerusalem, and "continued with one accord in prayer and supplication," waiting for the promise of the Father," the "baptism of the Holy Spirit." Peter stood up in the midst and made a brief address, and near its close he said: "Wherefore of these men, which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that He was taken up from us, *must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection.*" They appointed two, and then they prayed, and said: "THOU LORD, who knowest the hearts of all, show whether of these two THOU *hast chosen.*" They then cast their lots, and "the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the *eleven* Apostles." Matthias made twelve. And on the day of Pentecost they were all, Matthias with the eleven, baptized in the Holy Spirit. Cloven tongues, like as of fire, sat upon *each* of them. They were *all filled* with the Holy Spirit, and they *all*, Matthias included, spake with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. Was not all this an indorsement on the part of Christ of their action in the case of Matthias? Luke in Acts 2: 14, adds: "But Peter standing up with the *eleven*," &c. All are filled with the Holy Spirit; all speak with tongues, and Peter stands up *with the eleven*, Matthias making that number, and Peter making twelve.

(b) But this is not all. Paul did not consider himself as one of the twelve. In 1 Cor. 15, speaking of the resurrection of Christ, and the witnesses to that event, he says: "And that He was seen of Cephas, *then of the TWELVE*; after that He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once." "After that He was seen of James; then of all the Apostles." "And last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

Paul does not include himself when he speaks of "the twelve," and of "all the Apostles," meaning the twelve; but he certainly embraces Matthias in that number. He speaks of himself in contrast with the twelve, as "one born out of due time," and forever settles this point by saying, "And last of all He was seen by me."

The new Jerusalem is said to have "twelve foundations, and in them the names of the *twelve* Apostles of the Lamb." Rev.

22: 14. Christians are built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." Eph. 2: 20-22.

(7) *The Apostleship of Paul.*

I think I have shown clearly that Paul was not one of the twelve. The commission he received from Christ clearly indicates his position in this regard. The Lord Jesus said to Paul: "But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness," &c. "Delivering thee from the people (of Israel), and from the Gentiles unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins," &c. Acts 26: 16-20.

Paul was pre-eminently the Apostle to the Gentiles; this was his special work, and he magnified his office. It was no part of the work of the twelve to make Apostles; hence the twelve did not make Paul one. His Apostleship was from the Lord Jesus: "Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead." "But I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, *is not after man*. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Gal. 1: 1-12.

It was not the prerogative of one Apostle to call, and ordain another Apostle, hence they could have no successors in office.

(8) *The Signs of an Apostle.*

False Messiahs and false Apostles appeared in the first century, and Paul speaks of the latter in 2 Cor. 11: 13-15:—"For such are false Apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works."

John, in his letter to the church at Ephesus, uses this language:

"And thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." Rev. 2: 2. All the Anti-Christians that have ever appeared, claimed either to be Christ, or to be His successors; and these Apostles claimed to be Apostles in fact, or to be their successors; and set up their authority against the true Apostles of our Lord Jesus. The Ephesian Christians "tried them," subjected them to a divine test, and "found them liars."

They said they were Apostles and were not. They did not have the "signs" necessary to attest their Apostleship. Their credentials were wanting.

What are the signs of the Apostleship? Let Paul answer: "Truly the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in *signs*, and *wonders*, and *mighty deeds*." 2 Cor. 12: 12. These signs, wonders, and mighty deeds, attested the claims of all the Apostles; and if these attestations were absent, they were not to be received as Christ's Apostles, no matter what their claims might be. 2 Peter 3: 2. Heb. 2: 3-4.

The Apostles of Christ received the commission from Him, to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," and, having thus commissioned them, He gave them power and authority to attest their claims as His ambassadors to the world; and they, though dead, yet speak to us in the Living Oracles, an imperishable legacy which they left in the hands of the church of the living God. And it is still true that those who hear them, hear Christ; and those who hear Christ, hear the everlasting Father. "To the law and the testimony, for if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them."

JNO. T. WALSH.

THE TRUE MISSION OF THE CHURCH.

There can be no doubt that the Apostolic Commission is unceasing in its application. The work of preaching Christ to men was to be done by the church, under organized and systematic management it is true, but by all, without exception and without a pause. "Go!" is the King's order. Christians are goers. They are not to stand and trifle, they are not to sit and wait for men to come to them; they are to move toward them, approach them, go to them with the gifts of the gospel. It is not permitted the church to rest within the limits of its four walls, its congregation, its community, its city, its state, or its land; nor is it allowed to the individual Christian to restrict himself to the narrow confines of his own heart, home, family, society, neighborhood, or region. On every side and to every soul this work extends until there is not a spot unsought nor a spirit unsaved in all the earth. From the Apostles spreading the doctrine of Christ in all Judea, Samaria, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, the church learns the meaning of this command and is to bear the same knowledge everywhere till there is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard.

"Go ye!" said Christ. The work is general. There are to be no stay-at-homes, nor idlers, no silent ones, with reference to the delivery of this message. The work of disclosing to men the beauties and glories of the redemption that is in Christ belongs to no special class. No privileged order is called to dispense it. Whether with or without learning, money, priestly ordination, skill of tongue or power of worldly influence, sanctified men are to go. The world is too big, the tribes too many, the souls of men too needy, that few should undertake this gigantic duty for Christ. The preciousness of the Gospel is too full and real with the men and women who have accepted it; its privileges too ennobling, comforting and helpful; the reign of Christ too benign, honorable and glorious that any subjects of the King should fail to seek the extension of its sovereignty, and the enlargement of its territory.

Every Christian is a minister; every regenerate soul a minister of good to men; every learner of Christ, according to ability and opportunity, a teacher of gospel truth to men.

The limits of this going is "all the world." Only the Son of God, when speaking to these humble, despised Galileans could look forward to the extension of His kingdom to the uttermost parts of the earth, and as they went and conquered, so the church of to-day must go. No difference of language, no distinction of race, no bounds of territory are to limit the progress of the teachers of Christianity. As in the beginning every region was trod by apostolic feet, every class of offenders against God's law received apostolic treatment, every race heard in their own tongue the wonderful works of God from apostolic lips, so to-day the church can not excuse herself for the neglect of this seed-sowing in any place where there is soil to receive it. The thought that God will save the heathen—those on the heath, barren, uncultivated—without the gospel, will not save the church if she dare refuse to send it to them. Her own families, society, community; whether she saves all that are there or not must not exhaust her means and energies in behalf of souls; but into all the world Christians must go either in person to do the work, or through agents supported by their benevolence in bearing the gospel to mankind.

As these go they are to preach. Proclamations of a message, whether by public speech, or informal conversation, or practical exhibition of what is taught, is to be the accompaniment of this going that others may receive this message and act upon it. How can they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher? The church must not be dumb.

The thing to be preached is revealed. This is no human word, no science or philosophy of human discovery, no system or school of earthly wisdom which the church is to proclaim, but the gospel; and not any gospel, nor many gospels, but the Gospel. The church is to announce thoroughly, so that all men can comprehend it, the one system of truth taught by Christ and the apostles, the message from Heaven borne to man under the direct operation of the Holy Spirit eighteen centuries ago. What this is, men are to learn from the pages of the New Testament, from the commandments of Jesus Christ, from the sermons of Peter and Paul, from the acceptance and obedience of men in the primitive, or,

rather, the apostolic age of the church. This doctrine is not to be found among the doctrines of men, it is the doctrine of God which Christ commands his people to go into all the world and proclaim.

Having learned this message and going forth as Christ requires, the church is to bear it to every creature. Some may not receive it, some may scorn it, but it is to be preached nevertheless. Some will not come to Christ, some will fight against the reign of Christ in their own hearts and in the world, but Christians must take heed to the doctrine, and preach it. Some will accept anything else but the gospel, the grossest lies and wildest delusions, but the church is not therefore excused from preaching the word to them. If it is faithfully preached, many will receive it; if it is gloriously lived, many will fall in love with its beauty, if men do not receive it, God is their judge: Our duty is done; to our master we can give answer without fear.

Bearing this message now to men the church must proclaim it fully. All its conditions, its threatenings as well as its promises. Christ and Him crucified is to be preached; all the value, the blood, the power of the Cross, and when men give heed, then he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Whatever men may say of essentials and non-essentials, of terms of pardon named in the creeds, of the justice or injustice, reason or unreason, importance or non-importance of scriptural conditions of salvation, Christians are to proclaim, if they would be faithful to their master, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

Whatever men may say of the mercy and goodness of God, of the universality of human salvation, of election, predestination, or reprobation, of uncovenanted mercies or final restoration, of the responsibility of God, and irresponsibility of man, of the severity of God's judgments and the terribleness of God's character, according to Scripture standards, to be true to the word and to the interests of the unsaved. We must also preach: "He that believeth not shall be damned."

Now all this gospel, all this preaching, all this care, with reference to what is preached, all this organization of a divine institution founded by God, built upon Jesus, the Christ, as the corner stone, and filled by the Holy Spirit; all has but one object, the salvation of souls. It is clear as any truth in the universe that this is the

mission of the church. If the church is not always aiming at this her work is a failure.

When Dr. Lyman Beecher was on his death-bed a ministerial brother said to him, "Dr. Beecher, you know a great deal: tell us what is the greatest of all things." The dying man answered, "It is not theology, it is not controversy, it is to save souls." We may instruct men in theory, we may sift before men in the controversial sieve the different systems of religious belief, commit men to divisions and rouse them to violent party strife, and still not reach their souls: and as the soul is the highest value in man, the man in man, so priceless that if a man shall gain the whole world, and yet lose it, he would not be profited, the greatest thing must be to save souls.

In the light of revelation, what is the condition of man? Lost. The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost, and the gospel, which is the power of God to every one that believeth, was to be preached to every creature. "All men like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way." "There is none good; no, not one." Men in every age, of every clime, with every degree of cultivation, are sinners before God. The Father has given His Son; the Son, His life; the Father and Son, the Holy Spirit; the Spirit, the Word of the Gospel; and "there is no other name given under Heaven whereby we must be saved." Again, all the races of men are to be saved or lost in this life. "Now is the day of salvation." "To-day, if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might." "Brethren the time is short." If not saved here, men are lost forever. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." "He that believeth not shall be damned." Even in their unbelief and rebellion men must be conquered by Christ. At death, in judgment, men must yield. Every knee shall bow and every tongue confess him. Julian, the apostate, in the days of his prosperity, pointed his dagger toward heaven and defied "the Galilean," as he was wont to call the Redeemer he once had worshiped. Starting on his last journey, one of his attendants, Libanius, the Rhetorician, asked of a Christian, "What is the Carpenter's son doing now?" "Making a coffin for your emperor," was the prophetic answer. A Persian arrow soon after pierced his breast, and lifting his hands dripping with his heart's blood, he moaned out his dying "Vicisti." "Thou hast conquered,

O Galilean!" and expired. In death, in judgment, in eternity, Christ must conquer every soul now in rebellion against him, but the vengeance will be terrible. Now and here souls must be brought into subjection to him that the submission may be glorious.

It is then the most serious thing in every Christian's life to save souls. How anxious then the practical question: how may souls be saved? Two things are necessary in this work which the church must supply: A faithful ministry, a sanctified people. First, how can they call on Him in whom they have not believed, and how can they believe in Him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher, and how can they preach except they be sent? These are pertinent questions in our day. For the preacher three things are needed: A place to preach, a people to preach to, something to preach. God has provided that which is to be preached. The gospel, the doctrine of the Nazarene is to revolutionize the world. "I make known unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand, by which also ye are saved if ye hold it fast." "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

How is the preacher to convince men of sin? Preach the word. How is he to overcome false science, destroy intemperance, make men Christians, heal divisions, sanctify souls, make the church a glorious church without spot or wrinkle, be fresh, strong, useful in his preaching; win the greatest glory for Jesus of Nazareth, the highest honor for himself, the widest recognition of power as a christian, the dearest joy in an eternal world? Preach the word. Not theology, not controversy, not science, not Aesthetics, not self, not the jargon of creeds or the theories of unbelief, but Christ and him crucified, the sublime facts of the simple gospel of Christ which have shaken the universe of God and must continue to shake it until there shall upheave and roll forth from among the stars the new heaven and the new earth.

Then this gospel is to be preached in every place. We build churches and publish set hours of service. It accords with our social way. This may not be enough. There may be precious openings to human souls lost to us. Christ taught in the synagogues and in the streets, and in the olive groves by the sea. The apostles went everywhere preaching the word. They did not announce a

fixed hour, and place, and wait for the people to come to them. They went to the people. The word in the marching orders of the leader, "Go," unquestionably means "Go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in." Hence it may be obligatory upon the gospel teachers to preach on the streets, at the wharves, in the groves and fields, and by the streams; to preach not Sunday only, but Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, at every hour and in every place where the gospel may be declared and received favorably. Not that men are always to preach formal sermons with all the accompaniments of hymns and prayers; firstly, secondly and thirdly; with exordium, connexion, division, discussion, and application; but preach enough to convince of sin and to show the way of life plainly. Thus in the work of evangelizing our great cities it is a grave question whether the Church is doing her duty. Private house-to-house teaching is important and covers the case in part, but should not every congregation have preaching points in destitute districts and men to care for them where publicly, from time to time, souls may be fed with the bread of life?

McAll's work in the white fields of France is worthy of note here. In August, 1871, Mr. McAll, pastor of a little church in Hadleigh, visited Paris, accompanied by his wife, for a few days of rest. Summer vacations of ministers may be attended with valuable results, as this proved. The sympathy of the McAll's for the common people led them into the artisan district of Bellville, where they contrived to meet the working men as they returned home at night and to offer them tracts which were often gladly accepted. Mr. McAll and his wife were so impressed by the needs of the people, that shortly after, they left their English home to settle in Paris, and with the new year they opened the first Mission room in Bellville with an attendance of above forty persons. It was hard at first to convince the people that the meetings were actually free, but as soon as the disinterested character of those who conducted them became known, their devotion was warmly appreciated and their simple religious instruction was sought and listened to with such eagerness that the mission has grown steadily until there are now in the most crowded faubourgs of Paris, twenty-five of these stations, where evening meetings for working men are held two or three times a week. The plainly furnished rooms used for this purpose were formerly shops where the partitions had been re-

moved so that they contain, on an average, two or three hundred settings. The rooms are in almost constant use, for besides the evening meetings there are afternoon classes for children, Sunday school, and Bible classes. Sometimes industrial schools for girls and employment rooms for poor women are added. Each station is supplied with a small lending library where a large proportion of the books are Bibles and Testaments. The meetings are very simply conducted, hymns alternating with short addresses and reading. Political allusions and religious controversy are wholly shunned.

The Police and higher officers of the government have frequently expressed good will toward the movement, and with reason, for during the agitations of recent years, two districts formerly the most turbulent, Bellville and the Faubourg St. Antoine, have been unexpectedly quiet and the authorities have not failed to notice the calming influence exerted by the missions in those quarters. Branches of this work have been started in Lyons, Marseilles and Bordeaux and other cities, are inviting them. There is no question that this is the way to reach the masses with religious teaching, and we are to remember that the masses are the masses, that the common people who heard Him gladly are in the great majority.

The third essential in the preacher's work—a people to preach to is a matter of no small moment. The church may provide elegant temples or humble stations and able and devout proclaimers of the gospel, but what value is the most eloquent presentation of the truth of God if there is no body to listen to it. Faith cometh by hearing. We want ears. It seems hardly, for example, a profitable expenditure of force and truth to stand up and proclaim the gospel to one hundred or two hundred persons Lord's Day after Lord's Day the year round, when three hundred or five hundred might just as well attend upon its proclamation. It seems scarcely useful to enter upon full and earnest expositions of what are known as "First Principles" when none to whom such teaching would be valuable are present to hear and no effort is made to attract such listeners to the sanctuary. And here might be considered the question of advertising services and how it should be done; of personal influence and how far it should be carried, of making church services attractive and what is legitimate and proper in this direction; of music, of variety, of sensational expedients; of the character of the preaching itself touching its power to draw ears, to win hearts, to make Christians. Should not our houses of worship be attrac-

tive; our services be in taste and time suited to the comfort and pleasure of our hearers; our members be diligent and earnest in their endeavor to bring the people out; our own personal efforts in the way of making acquaintances among the people, visiting men and women and children in their homes, and urging upon them the claims of the gospel, be put forth, and then from our pulpits must we not declare such power, but in a winning way, the truth of God? The gospel is glad tidings, and must it not be so presented by the preacher and by the Church that it shall be glad tidings to the people? so that they shall attend upon its proclamation with gladness and gladly obey it? Let your light so shine before men, i. e., after the manner of the cheerful lamp on the stand, that they may see your good works and glorify your father which is in Heaven. Paul and Barnabus at Iconium *so spake* that a great multitude, both Jews and Greeks believed.

What mistaken ideas men have of the nature of this work! How utterly unscriptural, unchrist-like, and unapostolic is much of our preaching! We have the story of the young preacher who went to a Presbyterian church in a certain town to preach his first sermon. Before leaving the house the gentleman who is entertaining him suggests to him that he should not preach against the Universalists. "There are several Universalist families who have pews in our church, and we don't want them offended." The young minister promises. At the church vestibule one of the deacons draws him aside and says: "Do you see those gentlemen just passing in? They are Spiritualists but come here to church occasionally. I wish you would be careful not to say anything to hurt their feelings." The minister promises. Ascending the pulpit steps one of the Elders button-holes him for a moment to whisper an additional caution: "The leading liquor dealer has just come into church, and he gives us a lift sometimes. I wish you'd be particular not to allude to the whiskey business or the temperance question." The young man, fairly frightened to see the moral ground thus narrowing before him, inquires: "Pray who or what shall I preach against, then?" With an air of triumph, the Elder replies, "Preach against the Jews; they hav'nt a friend in town!"

Now if preaching is the art of not hurting anybody, that surely would have been an effective direction for the sermon, but if it means the application of truth to mind and conscience, the declaration of man's sin, Christ's salvation, the delivery of the whole

counsel of God in regard to human life and destiny, the searching after, suiting the sword of the spirit to, and saving of immortal souls whoever and wherever they are; if every sermon be a shot aimed at a target and fire what determination to strike, then that is most effective preaching which lays the arrow on the string or loads the rifle with powder and ball for present effect, which aims at the sins and sorrows that are straight before it, and which determines the effectiveness of the aim by the fluttering and falling of the game!

The second essential in this great mission is a sanctified people. Perhaps this should be put first. The preacher must be sanctified for he is included in the Church. No preaching of the gospel, however earnest or eloquent can avail when it comes from an unholy man. No prominence of ecclesiastical architecture, glory of stained-glass windows and glare of gas, thunder of organ tones and trills of vocal melody, mass of human beings drinking in honeyed words however glowing and true; no such instrumentalities can ever save souls where the truth has no practical illustration of its divine excellence and power. Listeners may be secured, sectaries may be made, a club kept together so long as the esthetic attractions are offered, but not souls saved; nothing has such power as sanctified life. Nothing makes a man so much in love with purity as purity. Many a man has been lifted out of debasing sins against which he has vainly struggled for years by coming to know and love a pure, sweet woman. Many a mother by the quiet usefulness of her life fills her children with a desire to be like her, which makes them in turn unselfish. Many an obscure man or woman who in a life time has uttered hardly a word of conscious teaching has by example done more to make people gentle, truthful and christ-like than many a preacher could do. It is the sight of embodied goodness that makes us good. It is not those who talk about goodness, but those who are good, that are the light of the world. And when our Lord speaks of the Church as the light of the world, of Christian men and women as the salt of the earth, he means the whole body of Christians, men and women, old and young, feeble and strong, rich and poor, wise and unwise; every one in some degree, to present this preserving influence, this illuminating power.

Just here grave questions arise which puzzle the faithful shepherd of every congregation of the Lord's people. How shall we

develop the latent talent of our membership? How shall the young people be made useful in the church? How shall the full powers of every disciple of Christ be brought out and enlisted in the work of saving souls? "Christian workers" are talked of as if they were a peculiar class in the church. What are Christian idlers, or Christian players? Is the preacher the only man who should ever speak to a man about his soul? Are the elders the select few in the church who may approach the thoughtless, the ungodly, and teach them about Christ? Are the old men and old women the chosen vessels to do the service of visiting, exhorting, praying for and gathering in of souls? Has not every Christian the right, and upon every Christian does there not devolve the duty of sowing and reaping for God? What a power, constant, wide-reaching, terrifying to the enemies of Christ, must be that church where every member is on the watch for opportunities at the mercy seat for blessings, and in the fields for souls? There is not a man, woman, or child in the body of Christ, who does not live, and move, and have his being right in the midst of the work, and who is not now, this present hour, called by every consideration that ever bore upon Obelin, or Judson, or Wesley, or Moody, to move right forward in this line of duty.

It will not do to wait until men get beyond the power of help. It is not an unreasonable conclusion that if half of the attention that is paid sometimes on the death-bed or beneath the shadows of the gallows-beam had been paid the erring one before the fatal hour, the soul would have been rescued. There is a world of significance in the story of the Ware family, which comes from New Jersey. Camden witnessed a sensation—a hanging. It is a text which preaches its own sermon.

The Ware family consisted of father, mother, children, and the father's mistress, and the glimpse given us of their daily domestic life, reveals a depth of obscenity, vileness and barbarism, beside which, travelers' pictures of the family relations of naked Africans are actually a decent and civilized relief. These Wares, men and women, Christian teachers would tell us, are not descendants, either of swine or monkeys, but hold, each of them, an immortal spirit, which can be made a noble actor in this life, and after it, a denizen of Heaven. What are the facts? If there were any such chance for them, they knew nothing of it. If there were any-absolute power, who with a touch could fill their lives of jug-

gling, and fighting, and debauchery, with cleanliness and pure affections, nobody had told them of him. Christ to them was simply a name to add jest and relish to an oath. They could not read of Him or of any life outside of their own daily limit of work or drunken idleness.

There are inexorable bars about some human lives, compared to which the pens and cages of the beasts are but trivial barriers. The home in which this ignorance and heathenism was to be found was not in Barbary or in Patagonia, but in a pleasant New Jersey village, full of Churches, half way between New York and Philadelphia, whence annually thousands are sent out to Foreign Missions. Nobody interfered with the normal brutality of these people, however, until one brute killed the other and was promptly sentenced to death by Christian law. Then the efforts made to draw from the murderer a confession of his faith in Christ and hope of Heaven would be ludicrous if they were not so terrible. Ware, however, stolidly refused to add another to the list of triumphant gallows saints. "Don't believe in Jesus," he said quietly. "I don't know anything about him." This man's cell was crowded with clergymen and young men of the Christian Association. Some zealous missionary wrote a letter to him, it was said, in his wife's name, urging him to repent, and sent him the pious fraud, but he listened with obdurate indifference. Good men, old and young, went with him to the scaffold urging him with tears, to give some sign of hope in Christ. The very sheriff, horror-struck at his duty of sending an unrepentant soul to its judgement before God, took his hand after the rope was on his neck, and the world hid from his eyes forever, and asked for some sign that he looked to Jesus, the Savior of the world. But Ware shook his head, and so went to meet God, whom he did not know, and could not trust. In his confession he says: "If I had ever received half the attention before I got into this cage that I have since, I never would have been here." We don't know whether the Christian men about him understood his meaning, or whether, as one Friday after another, we celebrate the crucifixion of the Nazarene by this kind of work, any of us remember that there is a judge who goes behind the returns, who looks behind the trial, and the murder, and utters the sentence as of old: "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth against thee from the ground."

Who knows who is at his door? Is not a soul a soul, and

the soul's danger the soul's danger the world over? Interesting questions may arise as to the manner of going to work to save souls—in what spirit—by what approaches shall we seek them? But the Church must not spend herself in questions and the discussion of plans. While the doctors wrangle the patient dies. Every man, together with his God, must be the committee of ways and means on this subject. Then the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove are needed. It will not do to come to one as an enthusiastic worker during a revival approached the writer on the streets of the Capitol soon after he came to the city, with a rough: "and who are you? and why don't you come to our meetings?" Or as an old lady on a street car addressed a member of the writer's congregation, whose hair is grey, and worn off on the top, and who has forgotten the day when he became a Christian, so long ago has it been, and depositing a fresh tract in his lap, said solemnly: "Yqung man, prepare to meet your God!" Or yet as a good old bungling parson, in his hard unsmling way, and in a voice like thunder, asked a nervous little fellow in the Sunday School, suddenly: "Who made the world in six days and rested on the seventh?" "I did! I did!" screamed the child, frightened beyond measure and bursting into tears, "I did! but I'll never do it any more!" That is not soul-winning. We want prayer—prayer for special souls. We want talk—free, earnest, loving words that will awaken. We want the pen—the penning of a kind, yearning letter to a gay, godless one, will often do the work. We want the press, the tract, the leaflet, the religious paper that will suit some case, sent here and there as they may be deemed useful. We want friends pleading with friends, parents with children, neighbors with neighbors, the whole Church persuading men and women to come and hear the Word, and the whole Church at the same hour Saturday night praying for their preacher's work on the following day. We want "all at it, and always at it," as good Wesley would say, and above all, every disciple of Christ to be a living epistle, to be known and read of all men. We want the Church to remember that her mission is to save men; not theology, nor controversy, nor temporal power, nor the impression of ecclesiastical dignity and grandeur, but the salvation of souls. Then the work of turning the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ will be easy, glad, abundant.

F. D. POWER.

AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for February contains a lengthy article on *The Christian Religion*, by George P. Fisher, Professor of ecclesiastical history in the Yale Divinity School. He is replying to Ingersoll's last article, but studiously avoids mentioning Ingersoll's name. Every one who reads it will know the occasion of its being written, and it seems to us that this studied avoidance of the name of the writer that he is opposing smacks either of Pharisaism or pedantry. Some Christian men deplore that other Christian men should reply to Ingersoll, on the ground that he is not entitled to such recognition, and that it is giving him a notoriety and a respectability to which he is not entitled. When he is continually delivering his lectures in the principal cities, and when his printed lectures have been sold to the extent of a million copies, the force of the objection, that reviews of him "advertise" him, loses its strength. Assaults on Christianity do not have to be advertised. Men of a certain class, and it is a very large class, seek for these assaults, and when found they call in their neighbors to rejoice with them. Christianity is compelled to wage a continual warfare, both offensive and defensive. It was so when Christ was in the world, and he set his followers the example, and we are recreant to our trust if we do not continue the conflict. I have no sympathy with that dignified non-resistance that remains silent when Christianity is assailed! I am not in favor of remaining passive and permitting the slanderer to go unrebuked.

The article of Prof. Fisher is well written, and his positions and arguments are good, with a few exceptions.

When he treats of the credibility of the testimonies of the four historians, he fails to meet the objection that Ingersoll makes, who admits, with Prof. Fisher, that the discrepancies would make the testimony stronger, if it were not for the claim of inspiration.

The Professor does not meet this, but simply proves what the infidel admits.

Also, when he says, "The known fact—a fact attested by the Apostle Paul, an unimpeachable witness," he makes two statements which would be tolerably difficult for him to prove. "The known fact that the Apostles themselves professed to work miracles;" how can he prove that it was a "known fact," should the infidels deny it? Not surely by saying, "The Apostles said so, therefore we *know* it." He would probably not call that satisfactory. "Attested by the Apostle Paul, an *unimpeachable* witness." Paul's statements have been impeached, not only by avowed infidels, but by advanced thinkers, so whether he is an "unimpeachable witness" is an open question as between believers and unbelievers, and the Professor should not have stated it as an "admitted" fact.

Prof. Fisher makes some statements which show that the truths that we, as a religious people, have been teaching, are beginning to bear fruit. "Protestant Christians hold the Bible to be the sufficient and authoritative rule of faith and conduct. The Scriptures are the umpire in controversies." This is what we have been contending for all the time, but others have claimed and practiced that *expediency* should govern, and that "the church" might frame additional articles of practice or conduct. We are glad to see the religious world coming to such safe and true conclusions. As soon as Prof. Fisher's statement is accepted by any religious people, so soon will there be a union with us.

When he says, "Whatever in Greek philosophy or the uninspired sages of other peoples is true to human nature, Christianity welcomes as congenial with itself, and knows how to assimilate," he sacrifices perspicuity to rhetoric. What does he mean by "true to human nature"? The love of a mother for her child? If a Greek philosopher had spoken of that before the advent of the Messiah, Christianity would not have been welcoming it from the Greek, although it had previously called attention to it. The impulse to resent an injury, which is very true to human nature, might have been noticed by all the Greek philosophers and sages of other peoples, but we do not find Christ welcoming the fact as congenial to Christianity.

Notwithstanding these and similar small blemishes we are glad he wrote the article, and feel that God is bringing good out of evil

in causing Christians to study afresh the proofs and present them in such forms as will adapt them to general reading.

The March number of this magazine is a more interesting one than several of the preceding, containing, among its essays, the following: *The True Lesson of Protestantism*; *The Fallacies of Homœopathy*; and *The Results of Prohibitory Legislation*. The last by Neal Dow, the second by Prof. A. B. Palmer, and the first by John Fiske. We desire to call attention to the first:

"The immediate consequence of Luther's successful revolt was the formation of a great number of little churches, each with its creed. * * * This formation of new sects has gone on down to the present time, and there is no reason why it should not continue in future; but the period when educated men, of great and original powers, could take part in work of this sort has gone by forever. The foremost men are no longer heresiarchs; they are free-thinkers, each on his own account; and the formation of new sects is something which in the future is likely to be more and more confined to ignorant or half-educated classes of people. At the present day it is not the formation of new sects, but the decomposition of the old ones, that is the conspicuous phenomenon inviting our attention. The latter half of the nineteenth century will be known to the future historian as especially the era of the decomposition of orthodoxies. People, as a rule, do not now pass over from one church into another, but they remain in their own churches while modifying their theological opinions, and in this way the orthodoxy of every church is gradually but surely losing its consistency. * * * An Anglican divine may preach whatever doctrine he likes, provided, doubtless, that he avoid certain obnoxious catch-words.

"Will the present decomposition of beliefs be succeeded by a period of reconstruction, in which the teachings of some church shall be accepted as authoritative concerning questions of a purely religious nature, or will the decomposition go on until the last vestige of recognition of religious questions shall have vanished, and all educated men shall have become atheistic materialists? * * I propose to show that neither materialism on the one hand, nor any species of ecclesiastical orthodoxy on the other hand, is likely to become prevalent in the future.

"Will the time ever come again when men will be absorbed in questions of a transcendental or ontological character, as Aquinas and other great mediæval thinkers were absorbed? But if it be asked whether there can ever again be a theological renaissance of such a character that men shall agree to surrender their right of private judgment on purely religious questions, and accept the teachings of any church, the reply must be that any renaissance of this sort is utterly impossible. The further question, whether unity of belief can ever be secured in any other way, is to be met by the assertion *that unity of belief is no longer either possible or desirable*. * * It is at last beginning to be apprehended that if unity of belief is to have any real value, it can only be when it is the result of the free working of different minds. But unity of

belief in religious matters is not very likely to be reached in any such way.

* * But if I hold one opinion concerning the conscious existence of the soul after death, while my neighbor holds a contrary opinion, I am not entitled to expect that we can ever be brought to an agreement. * * And thus we arrive at last at the true lesson of Protestantism, which is simply this: that religious belief is something which in no way concerns society, but which concerns only the individual."

Our readers must pardon this long extract, the occasion demands it. In this article we have an expression of the *peculiar* mode of thinking of a certain class of men who claim to be the *educated*. They are to a great extent moulding public thought, for they do not hide their lights under a bushel, but set them on as high stands as the printing press or platform can give. Although they are educated and are men of strong minds, yet on the subject of Christianity they are very ignorant. Christianity is not a system of human philosophy, it is not a theory, and while it is spiritual, it is very practical. It stands before mankind *sui generis*, peerless, immeasurable, to be judged only by itself. Metaphysics is not Christianity, and here is where the "educated thinkers" fall into error, and when Mr. Fiske says that "unity of belief is no longer either possible or desirable," we understand that he holds *belief* to be an *opinion* about such questions as the consciousness of a soul after death, and here is where we see that "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." The reason that the "foremost men" are no longer heresiarchs is that they are free-thinkers, as they style themselves, but more correctly infidels; men who deny the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Bible. I do not believe that questions of a metaphysical character will ever again agitate the world to the extent of forming sects, but I do believe that these "foremost men" will continue to discuss and speculate upon such questions, neglecting the kernel while feeding upon the husks, and in this occupation lose their souls. Christ has no use for these "foremost men," who are heady and puffed up with their own conceit, but he delights in the humble. I believe that the latter half of the nineteenth century will be the era of the decomposition of orthodoxies. There are two classes of men; the one class is composed of the "foremost men," who will continually demand more and more liberty of thought, and will continue to worship more and more the *Ego*, until the Bible will be entirely discarded except as a system of philosophy; and the other class is composed of those who with the whole heart believe unto right-

eousness and humbly desire to do every command of the Master. These are searching with prayerful hearts to learn His will, fully determined to do it when known; all such will gradually succeed in scattering the mists that these "foremost men" of past ages have thrown over God's revelation, and will ultimately come into the full sunlight of the truth and thereby into the unity of the faith.

The true lesson of Protestantism is that as Luther *protested* against the corrupt practices of the Catholic Church, so will devout men now protest against the corrupt teachings of the Orthodox Churches.

We have received a pamphlet from the Publisher of the *North American Review*, containing the articles published in that magazine on the "Christian Religion," by Ingersoll, Black and Fisher. It can be had from the Publisher, No. 30 Lafayette Place, New York, for fifty cents.

THE EPISCOPAL RECORDER AND COVENANT, the organ of the reformed movement in the Episcopal Church, of January 21st, gives us a very kind and complimentary notice, which we fully appreciate. In this notice he refers to the article on *Revision* by Bro. Mathews, and pleasantly observes that it was fortunate for him that "baptize" was not changed to "immerse," for had it been and Bro. Mathews had been *immersed*, he would not have written his article, "for that which is immersed must so continue, and to take it out would be transforming immersion into dipping." We would like to enquire how anything can be "dipped" without being "immersed." If the *Recorder and Covenant* will teach "dipping" as Christian baptism to the exclusion of "pouring" or "sprinkling," we will be satisfied as to the "thing done." But just how the idea of "coming out" attaches more to dipping than immersing I cannot see. "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came up out of the water," &c. If the eunuch was not dipped or immersed, it seems to me it was very unnecessary for Philip to go down into the water, or for that matter, the eunuch either. If he did not dip or immerse him, but poured or sprinkled him (which is a physical impossibility—he could sprinkle or pour water on him, but could not pour or sprinkle him, and the text says he *baptized*

him), why does not the Reformed Episcopal Church direct and require its ministers to "go down into the water, both the priest and the candidate," and pour or sprinkle him there, and then both come up out of the water? This is what the Bible says, why not do it? The Bible does not contradict itself, and if in other cases of baptism it should fail to say that they went down into the water, or even if the inference might be that they did not, we cannot put a silence or an inference against a positive declaration. As long as Acts 8:38 remains in the Bible you are bound "to go down into the water" to baptize, no matter what you do after you get "down into" it.

On the fourth page is printed an article from *James Balfour*, entitled HOW TO BE SAVED. We desire to call attention to two extracts from it, which we put immediately together, although separated in the article by considerable space:

"He that *believeth* on the Son *hath* everlasting life." (John 3:36. See also John 5:24), not he that believes and lives a holy life shall have eternal life when he dies, but he that believes, and on the moment that he believes, not shall have, but *hath* eternal life. A sinner, then, may take salvation as quickly as he can accept a gift—in a moment, for it only needs a moment to accept a gift."

"The Redeemer, before He ascended His throne to exercise all power in heaven and earth, gave an order for the universal proclamation of this Gospel, accompanied by a statement of the awfully solemn issues of accepting it or rejecting it, saying, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.'

These are two extracts from the same article, written by the same man. In the first, salvation present and future is granted in a *moment on belief*, in the second on *belief and baptism*. Which is true? Salvation is a gift, but it is not an unconditional gift. The recipient of the gift is required to do something. He cannot receive the gift until he believes; he cannot receive the gift until he believes and is baptized. This is not a contradiction—he must do both. Why ignore the one condition and exalt the other?

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH, for January contains several very interesting articles, some of a general character and some denominational. Of those of a general character we mention particularly the one entitled *Polemias*, also

the one on the *Inspiration of the Scriptures*, and of those of a denominational character we desire to call special attention to the one on *Methodistic Philosophy*. The one on *Polemics* is well written and is the companion piece to the one in the October, 1881, number, on *Irenics*. To most of what is said we can yield assent, though we cannot agree to the proposition that an opponent in debate must *not* be held to the logical consequences of his position. To whatever a proposition leads logically, the defender of that proposition must subscribe or else yield the proposition.

The article on *Inspiration* is valuable for the collection of the opinions of numerous eminent writers. It is a difficult question to decide between the several theories of Inspiration; the two extremes being, on the one hand a full and complete dictation by God of every word upon every subject, and the other that God inspired the writers to record his teachings in his very words, which words he chose with special care, but left the historical portions to their unaided memories. The latter seems to be the more reasonable position to assume, because they recorded teachings and prophecies with particular uniformity and differed in narrative as men now do looking at the same transaction from different standpoints.

The writer makes one statement that we reproduce:

"How cheering the thought that in no particular, essential to man's well-being and happiness, does the Bible contain an erroneous or defective statement; that in making known his will respecting man's character, conduct, and destiny, God carefully directed every utterance, that it might *imply no more and mean no less*, than is expressly declared."

We make the italics. Infidels, looking at the religious world with its divisions, ask this question: "Why did not Jesus say explicitly what he wished sinners to do; why did he not use a word that meant *sprinkle* in speaking of baptism if he desired his converts to be sprinkled?" It was not the poverty of the Greek language. If he did not use a definite word, (but we think he did), which our Methodist friends seem to think he did not, we join in the inquiry: Does βαπτίζοντες mean anything, and if it does, does it "*imply no more and mean no less*?"

The article, *Methodistic Philosophy* is a rather singular production. The author treats the subject under three divisions:

"I. The comparatively modern epoch in metaphysics. II. The assumption of a unit or selfhood, as a necessity in all philosophy. III. The underlying principles of Methodism and such a system of philosophy in harmony with the Bible."

The first division is simply historical. The second is a statement of his system of philosophy, and he states it thus:

"Our philosophy must explain ourselves; and if we ignore the self that philosophizes, we can never expect to realize the truth of what we are. There lies back of all thought, volition, and feeling, a *perduring somewhat*, whose sameness is preserved, and which is expressed by the personal pronoun I. As this is a common factor in all that we are, I would make this the foundation of all true philosophy."

If Wesley could have looked down the ages and have seen that Methodism was to become a system of philosophy based upon "*a perduring somewhat*," and the personal pronoun "I," we think he would have been frightened away from his commendable effort of trying to reform the young men of the Episcopal Church. "A perduring somewhat" is alarming to an ordinary Christian. Suppose Christ had said to his apostles: "It is given to you to know all the mysteries of the kingdom, and I will explain to you that my Church is founded upon a *perduring somewhat* and the *personal pronoun I*," do you not think they would have gone back to their fishing and have remained?

"A true Methodism puts a man upon his own responsibility, upon a consciousness of his own ability, to do or not to do a thing." "As Methodism advances, and its liberal and charitable views of God and man are becoming part and parcel of human thought, and consequently of human character, we find that those philosophers who made consciousness one test of truth are coming more and more into repute. Such are Descartes, Cousin, Cudworth, and Bledsoe."

It seems to us as if this was assuming that all the liberal and charitable views of God and man were confined to Methodism, whatever this liberality may mean, but we are free to confess that we do not quite understand what "liberal and charitable views of God" are. If they are such views as lead us to adopt the vagaries of Descartes, we are willing that Methodism may have the monopoly of them. We have no use for a philosophy that discards revelation and bases all knowledge on consciousness. The "*Cogito, ergo sum*" of Descartes, and his axiom "*that whatever is clearly and distinctly thought, must be true*," is too independent of faith to satisfy a Christian mind.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW of January, 1882, contains its usual variety of interesting articles. The first article, *Pres-*

ent Relation of Scientific Thought to Christianity, contains some valuable facts and a collection of original testimonies from living Scientists as to the harmony of true religion and science; but we must call attention to several loose expressions calculated to mislead and do harm:

"Mere opinions of men concerning either of these great systems of fact (Christianity and physical science) must be regarded as opinions merely, until their established harmony with fact shows them something more. A theologian's theories may be as far from Christianity as a scientific man's theories often are from science. The complete accord between the two systems will be seen when the last word has been said in both. We need not be over anxious for a formal adjustment, which could be only temporary and provisional at best, while the unfinished work is going forward."

The statement to which we object is, that our knowledge of Christianity, the laws of Christ's kingdom, is progressive as our knowledge of the laws of the physical universe; that the disciples who lived in the first centuries knew less of Christianity than we do now, and that as time rolls on, brighter and brighter light will break upon the sacred page until we will read it as it never was read before. We do not believe this. We believe that God's will and meaning shone as clearly to the human eye that first read the manuscript wet from the inspired writer's pen as they now do to the most cultured theologian (?) who studies the Bible to defend his creed or find some new thing. If the writer means that as time passes on the rubbish of human speculations will be cleared away from the divine commands and men will be permitted to read them as did the early disciples, then we can agree with him.

"You notice that I do not define Christianity in the formulas of any creed nor in the words of any master. * * * But I wish to signalize the important truth that for such discussions as this, and for all discussions, Christianity is Christ."

If creeds are not necessary in discussions where then are they necessary? If the only "article of faith" that can be tolerated in a discussion is that "Christianity is Christ," why have *other* articles of faith except for the purpose of keeping up the wall of partition, erected by human hands, between those who profess to love the Christ? We can see no other use for them, and hope to see the day when no human creed or "articles or confession of faith" will be known. The writer quotes and endorses the following extract from Dr. James Bryce:

"Christianity consists in a spirit, a living spirit and tendency, a growth of

moral ideas, which constantly go on developing themselves and renewing themselves from one age and generation to another, which are not capable of being expressed perfectly in the language of one generation, simply because they are not exhausted by that generation and not exhaustible by any generation."

In this extract, "spirit," "a living spirit and tendency" and "a growth of moral ideas" are used to express the same thing. These three things, referring to the same thing, is Christianity, and they are progressive and can not be expressed in the language of any generation. It seems to us that Christianity must have consisted of ideas that could have been expressed in the language of the age in which they were formulated or they never could have been revealed to humanity, unless Dr. Bryce means that Christ is constantly giving us new revelations. If he does not mean this, then he must mean that Christ failed to reveal himself perfectly, and that each generation is groping after truth in a twilight of incapacity, which is gradually brightening as the ages pass away. I don't believe this. I believe that the spirit of Christianity was fully revealed to us in the beginning, and that we are as favored now, as far as revealed religion is concerned, as the world will ever be.

While we believe that "Christianity is Christ," we object to the ireneism that would make the statement a mere platitude to smooth over sectarian differences. A true, vigorous christian manhood forces us to say that "Christianity is Christ as set forth in *all* of his precepts, commands and ordinances," and that if a man does not so accept Christ, he has not accepted him as he should.

The same number contains a lengthy and interesting article giving the *Theories of the Atonement*, and being more historical than analytical requires no special notice, the question being fully discussed in this number of this magazine. Another article of some interest is *The Resurrection of our Lord*, being a review of Dr. Milligan's work on that subject. That book is cordially indorsed by the reviewer. The purpose of the work being to show that the *human* gave place to the *divine* at the resurrection, and not at the ascension; therefore *we* will be resurrected and ascend in bodies resembling those we now possess; and that in Heaven we will know each other. Without entering into any discussion of these points, we desire simply to call attention to two statements that are probably not correct, and to the fact that the whole argument is based upon an assumption, a plan dangerous anywhere, more so in Bible

studies. He says: "That in his resurrection he came forth in the same fashion of body, but the functions of his body were changed. Before, he hungered and thirsted, and grew weary from travel; after, he neither eat nor rested, and that although the body had form, yet it was not material, that to it space and doors were no impediments; that before the resurrection he eat *with* them, afterwards *before* them." Does the narrative warrant this? Does not the account by Luke of the mob at Nazareth show that he could make himself invisible and pass through obstructions *then* as easily as he did *afterwards* when he entered into the room where the doors were shut, and when he vanished from the supper table in Emmaus? Is it not reasonable to suppose that he tarried with them at Emmaus as much to rest and eat as he did at the well in Samaria to rest and drink, and is it not very reasonable to conclude that when "he sat at meat with them," that he eat with them? Acts 10: 41, "Who did eat and drink with him after he arose from the dead." Such inaccuracies in small things spoil the charm of a very beautiful theory.

THE MISSOURI UNIVERSITY REVIEW, COLUMBIA, Mo., of February, is before me. It is the initial number, and is the beginning of an effort by several members of the Faculty to do something personally that should be done officially. That the University needs a first-class magazine there can be no doubt, and we hope the deficiency will not long remain, but that sufficient support may be given this effort to make it develop into what is needed.

The contents, as far as they go, are good, but the space is too limited. We hope that the State will take charge of it, but if not, then we hope the Editors will screw their courage to the point of enlarging it. The President of the University, S. S. Laws, LL. D., is Editor, and is assisted by Professors D. R. McAnally, B. F. Thomas and J. S. Blackwell. This number has several interesting articles, one, by the Editor, *The Bureau's Mistake*, being a sharp and deserved criticism of the Chief of the National Bureau of Education for the aid he has given to the "Spelling Reform"; one on *Literature in the District Schools*, by Prof. D. R. McAnally; one on *Normal Departments in State Universities*, by Miss Grace C. Bibb, Prof. of Pedagogics and Dean of the Normal Faculty; and one, a *Review of "Words; Their Use and Abuse, by Wm. Mathews,*

LL. D.," by Prof. J. S. Blackwell. It is a magazine of 64 pp., to be issued five times during the year.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for January commences its third year. It is published by Anson D. F. Randoloh & Co., 900 Broadway, N. Y. Of the seven essays contained in this number, three are entirely denominational, two are metaphysical, one of general and practical interest, and the other a review of *Prof. W. Robertson Smith on the Pentateuch*. The article of general interest is the one by Dunlop Moore, D. D., subject, *Sacramental Wine*. It is an able, exhaustive, and conclusive article. It discusses the question in the light of the controversy being carried on as to the kind of wine to be used in the Lord's Supper. He concludes rightly, we think, that it was *fermented* wine.

We would be glad to notice more at length the following exchanges, in this number, but space forbids: we will speak more fully of them in our next:

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE, for January and February, 1882. Published at No. 141 Franklin St., Boston, for \$3 per year.

THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, for January, 1882. Published at Lebanon, Tenn., for \$2 per year.

THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHIC QUARTERLY, October, 1881, and January, 1882. Published for the *American Institute of Christian Philosophy*, by Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 900 Broadway, N. Y. Price \$2 per year.

THE NEW JERUSALEM MAGAZINE, for January. Published by *The Massachusetts New-Church Union*, No. 169 Tremont St., Boston. Price \$2 per year.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, for January, 1882, contains 300 pp., neatly bound in muslin. Published by the *American Review Press*, New York.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, for January. Published by W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass. Price \$4 a year.

MANFORD'S MAGAZINE, for January and February, Chicago, Ill. Price \$1.50 a year.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

We promise to notice more fully the following books and pamphlets in the July number:

THE GOSPEL: THE COMMISSION; AND CONVERSION. By John Calien Risk, Canton, Mo., and THE EKKLESIA, OR THE CHURCH, by the same. Both from the Author.

THE USE OF TOBACCO, by Prof. J. I. D. Hinds, Lebanon, Tenn. From the Author.

LOOKING DOWN THE AGES FROM A PROPHETIC STANDPOINT, by John T. Walsh. Published by John Burns, St. Louis, Mo. From the Publisher.

NOTICE.

In the July number I expect to review JUDGMENT AND MERCY, by Canon Farrar. The same number is expected to contain, among others that I cannot now designate, articles on *Some Alleged Immoralities in the Bible*; *The Tendency of Protestantism*; and *The Barbarism and Cruelties of the Old Testament*.

ERRATUM: On page 127, middle of fourth line from top of page, instead of "fire what," read "fired with."

PAPERS AND PERIODICALS.

NOTE. The following is a list of the papers—weekly and monthly—published in the interest of the Christian Church. The list includes those published in the United States and elsewhere, so far as the names could be obtained:

WEEKLIES.

Christian Standard, Isaac Errett, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 The Christian, J. H. Garrison, J. H. Smart, St. Louis, Missouri.
 The Evangelist, B. W. Johnson, B. J. Radford, Chicago, Illinois.
 Christian Preacher, C. M. Wilmeth, Dallas, Texas.
 The Gospel Advocate, David Lipscomb, Nashville, Tennessee.
 Christian Messenger, T. R. Burnett, Bonham, Texas.
 Apostolic Times, J. W. Cox, Lexington, Kentucky.
 Christian Herald, D. T. Stanley, Monmouth, Oregon.
 Atlantic Missionary, P. S. Rhodes, Gordonsville, Virginia.
 American Christian Review, J. F. Rowe, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 The Old Path Guide, F. G. Allen, Louisville, Kentucky.
 The Christian Commonwealth, W. T. Moore, London, England.
 The Faithful Witness, J. M. Shepherd, Topeka, Kansas.

MONTHLIES.

Christian Monitor, Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin, St. Louis, Missouri.
 The Watch Tower, J. L. Winfield, New Berne, North Carolina.
 Bible Index and Christian Sentinel, H. McDiarmid, Toronto, Canada.
 Christian Worker, R. B. Neal, Louisville, Kentucky.
 The Apostolic Church, W. L. Butler, Mayfield, Kentucky.
 The Christian Foundation, Aaron Walker, Kokomo, Indiana.
 The Christian Missionary, F. M. Green, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 The Christian Telescope, J. M. Ratcliffe, Watkinsville, Georgia.
 The Pacific Church News, J. H. McGillough, San Francisco, Cal.
 The Christian Advocate, G. Y. Tickle, Edinburgh, Scotland.
 Australian Christian Advocate, T. Smith, Melbourne, Australia.
 The New Eng. Evangelist, F. N. Calvin and A. Martin, Worcester, Mass.

SEMI-MONTHLIES.

The Disciple, Thomas H. Blenus, River John, N. S.
 Ecclesiastical Observer, David King, Birmingham, England.
 Christian at Work, J. R. Farron, W. A. Cooke, Bell's Depot, Tenn.

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS—MONTHLY.

The Teacher's Mentor, Isaac Errett, F. M. Green, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Christian Sunday School Teacher, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.
 Parents' and Teachers' Monthly, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
 The Gospel Teacher, J. H. Hardin, St. Louis, Missouri.

WEEKLY.

Sunday School Standard, ———, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 The Little Christian, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.
 The Little Sower, W. W. Dowling, St. Louis, Missouri.
 Good Words, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
 The Little Child, ———, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Little Pearls, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
 The Sunny Side, J. H. Hardin, St. Louis, Missouri.
 The Little Ones, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.

THE REVIEW.

JULY, 1882.

OUR RELATIONS TO THE DENOMINATIONS.

"None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself," So wrote an apostle, an ambassador of that King, to the increase of whose kingdom there shall be no end. The truth of the statement is guaranteed to us by that spirit of inspiration which was given to the apostles that they might know the things which God has freely given to men. It has been attested by the experience of all men from the day it was written to this day. Individuals find themselves sustaining multitudinous relations to persons and things outside of themselves.

All associations of men are made up of individuals; and the associations themselves, like the individuals that compose them, are not disconnected and wholly independent one of another, but are related and inter-related in a thousand ways. Some of the relations of individuals are optional and some are necessary. The same is true of the relations of associations.

A young man of twenty-five years of age, well formed and well developed physically, of sound body and vigorous health, energetic and active, possessing a competence of the world's goods, of highly cultivated intellect and pleasing manners, honorable, upright and conscientious, always and under all circumstances, tenderly regarding man and reverently fearing God, may, if he

[This paper was written especially for "The Christian Ministerial Association of the Military District of Illinois," and was read before that body at its annual meeting in Blandinsville, March 27-31, 1882. By unanimous vote of the Association, it was requested for publication in THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.]

choose, assume the marriage relation; or he may exercise his option and continue in that state which has been denominated the "state of single blessedness." But this same young man, with all his excellencies, and all his options, cannot choose who shall be his father or his mother, his brother or his sister, what tongue shall be his mother tongue, or of what continent or island he shall be a native. These and many other are relations that are fixed, and unalterably fixed without his will or choice. "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."¹ The relations that every man sustain to him, are constantly affected in and by his life, and they are affected also by his death. And so also of bodies of men, and we may truly say: No religious body liveth to itself, and no religious body dieth to itself.

The topic assigned me—Our Relations to the Denominations—seems to me to be one both difficult and delicate to handle. I could wish it in more competent and courteous hands. Not that I mean to be discourteous or arrogant, nor to make invidious comparisons between ourselves and other religious bodies, to whose members I most sincerely and cheerfully accord the same candor and honesty of purpose which I claim for ourselves. But still, I dare not flatter myself that I shall be able to say what needs to be said in a frank and manly discussion of this subject, and yet say it without incurring the danger of at least, being considered deficient in courtesy. There is the compensating reflection, however, that truth is never very pliant, never very much concerned about being *considered* courteous, especially at the sacrifice of itself.

I have characterized the topic as difficult and delicate—difficult, because of the many changes and complications that have occurred since the apostolic age; because of the corruption and apostasy of the church; and because of the earnest, struggling efforts of good men and women to come up out of the darkness and dreariness of the long gloomy night of apostasy, and diligently to seek the true light and cheer of the Sun of righteousness with healing in his wings—delicate, because the corrupt and corrupting seeds and humors of the apostasy, still festering in the flesh of the denominations, it may be also in our flesh, render them, and us, perchance, exceedingly tender and sensitive to the touch of any hand that would, however lovingly, remove them from the body religious. The very fact that men shrink and flinch when the subject

of the relations of the religious bodies to each other is broached; that the face so often flushes and the pulse quickens; should suggest that there is a disturbing cause at work and making itself felt in the system, which ought to be and must be removed, before the soreness will be entirely healed and before the inflammation will permanently subside.

In discussing our relations to the denominations we are discussing the relations of one religious body to other religious bodies, and it is perhaps well to pause a little to notice the terms embodying the subject of thought. To whom, then, does the word *our* here refer? It, of course, limits relations, but it has a reference also to those who sustain the relations limited by it. This reference is to the body of professed Christians with which the members of this Ministerial Association are identified, with which they co-operate, in which they find their religious home, to the diffusion of whose principles and spirit they profess to dedicate their lives for the good of men and for the glory of God, in time and in eternity. This body, they and all who are in immediate association and sympathy with them, call the church of God, the church of Christ, the Christian church, or simply the church; sometimes, also, the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven, and by such other names as they find applied in the New Testament scriptures to the church of God. The same body is called by others the Disciples' church, the church of the Disciples, the Campbellite Baptist church or simply the Campbellite church, and by other appellations which it would be irreverent and dishonoring to apply to the church of God. Of those who use these designations, some are religious and some are irreligious. We have thought these dishonoring appellations are used sometimes through innocent, and sometimes, through guilty ignorance, and sometimes through causes less honorable than ignorance.

The word *relations*, as here used, I understand to mean connections between objects, conditions or states of objects with reference to other objects.

The word *denomination* is defined by Worcester thus: A division, a class, a sect; particularly of Christians. *Sect*, as defined by the same author, means a body of persons who follow some teacher; a body of persons united in some settled tenets, as in religion or philosophy; a religious denomination or a philosophical

school. Webster defines *denomination* as follows: A class, collection of individuals, called by the same name; a sect; as, a denomination of Christians. *Sect* he defines, 1. a part cut off; a cutting, a scion; 2. hence, a body of persons who have separated from others in virtue of some special doctrine, or set of doctrines, which they hold in common; a school or denomination; especially a religious denomination.

The topic of this paper, then, is, what are the relations of that religious body, which its members would have known by no other than scriptural names, to all the religious sects in the world, by whatever name known, and especially to those denominated Christian sects?

It is commonly assumed, and firmly held, by ourselves, that we are not one of the denominations. It is quite as commonly assumed, as firmly held, and generally, I think we may say, as honestly believed, by the denominations and by the world, that we are one of the denominations. The following quotations, I think, show pretty fairly the light in which we are viewed by others. In the "Outline of Church History," by J. H. Hurst, D.D., in a table of "denominational statistics of the United States," we find "Disciples, (Campbellites), 350,000." Thus by this author we are assigned a place among the denominations. In another part of the same work, the following is his enumeration of "Minor Baptist Churches: Anti-Mission; Free-Will; Seventh-Day; Church of God, or Winebrennarians; Disciples of Christ, or Campbellites; Tunkers; Mennonites." So in a list of sects of a sect, including seven places, this author gives us the fifth place. The book from which these quotations are made is used as a text-book in that numerous and wide-spread class of readers and students, "The Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle." A writer in the *Church Union* of the 16th of this month, says: "Almost a century ago, some saw the evils of dissensions, and their remedy was to come out, and they formed another sect—the Christian. Not but what they had as good a right to exist as any other, and a better if their basis was better—and I am inclined to think it was. But to tear down all existing organizations to make room for another, I think is not the best way. The Christians and Disciples have often added another to the number of churches in a place where there were already too many." With this author I fully agree that to

tear down all existing organizations to make room for another is not the best way, if that other is of the same kind. If, as this writer holds, the Disciples formed a new sect, then I would be glad, for one, to see the career of that new sect speedily ended. The end cannot come too soon to please me. I believe it cannot come too soon to please God. I have, and can have, no more respect for a sect because it is ours than I have for one because it is not ours.

But from the quotations above, and from what we know to be the general opinion on this subject, nothing is clearer than that we do not see ourselves as others see us. That we may not think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, we should, at least, be able to see how others view us, whether we can then see ourselves as they see us or not. But it is a matter of much greater moment to us to see ourselves as God sees us than that we see ourselves as our fellows see us. If, in the sight of God, we are a denomination, a sect, would to God that the earnest, fervent, effectual prayer of every one of us might go up to God, as the prayers of Cornelius of old, a memorial before God, that he would grant us to see, and to put far from us, that which makes us a sect, denomination. I heartily adopt as my own, and earnestly commend to the adoption of all my brethren, Pope's prayer :

" If I am right, thy grace impart,
Still in the right to stay ;
If I am wrong, O teach my heart
To find that better way !"

We have long been crying out against denominations ; but so did David cry out against his own crime, not knowing when he said, "As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this thing shall surely die," that he was passing sentence of death on himself. But the voice of God's prophet opened his eyes, when the prophet responded, "Thou art the man." So when Judah said of the partner of his own guilt, "Bring her forth, and let her be burnt," he little thought that he was passing so severe a sentence upon his own accomplice, until the woman presented before him his own familiar pledges of the payment of the price of his indulgence, which he now so justly condemned.

But if we are not one among the many denominations, what are our relations to the denominations ? If any one of my

brethren, or any one of any denomination, who hears this address, shall feel sure, after he has heard it, that we are a denomination, I respectfully and earnestly ask him, in the fear of God and in the love of truth, to respond, at his convenience, to these questions; and to favor me with a copy of his response: 1. Is the church of Christ a sect or a denomination in the sense in which these words are commonly used? 2. Can one be identified with, and an active member of, the church of Christ, in our day, without being identified with a sect? 3. If one can be thus identified with the church of Christ, and yet not be identified with any sect or denomination, how can he be so identified? The man who can show me that I am now identified, in my church relations, with a sect, and can show me how I may be identified with the church of Christ without any sect identification, will place me under a debt of perpetual gratitude to him, and will have the pleasure, if pleasure it would be to him, of seeing me change my church relations without further conference with flesh and blood.

But assuming for the present, that which I have indicated to be commonly assumed among us; namely, that we are not a sect or a denomination, I come to the question, What are our relations to the denominations? It is proposed now briefly to notice some of these relations under the following heads: 1. Our numerical relations; 2. Our chronological and historical relations; 3. Our structural and doctrinal relations.

1. **OUR NUMERICAL RELATIONS.**—In regard to numbers, talent, scriptural attainments, &c., &c., we have sometimes noticed a little inclination to what seemed to be foolish boasting. But if an apostle could ask indulgence and forbearance in foolish boasting, probably a certain degree of boasting on the part of members of the Christian church of our day ought not to be too severely censured, especially in view of the success that has crowned the efforts of the church, made in the face of fearful odds. Our numerical strength in the United States alone is variously estimated at from 350,000 to 700,000. Here, as in many other cases, the truth probably lies between the two extremes. I have not sufficiently reliable data at hand to give the extremes of the estimate for the remaining parts of the world. But whatever may be reasonably claimed to be our strength, a view of the religious statistics of the world will sufficiently show our numerical weakness, both

in comparison with the population of the world and with the part of that population included in the bodies classed as Christian denominations.

A recent statistical table distributes the population of the world religiously as follows: To Christianity 418,000,000; to Buddhism 400,000,000; to Mohammedanism 215,000,000; to Brahmanism 175,000,000; to Judaism 7,000,000; to all other forms of religious belief 174,000,000. That is, out of every ten of the world's inhabitants, three are classed as Christians. Of these Christians 83,000,000, in round numbers, are referred to the eastern or oriental churches, all of whom have bishops for whom they claim apostolic succession. To the Roman Catholic church belong 211,000,000, with whom the recognition of the Pope as the head of the church is a fundamental article of faith. 124,000,000 are numbered as Protestants, of all denominations and creeds. Of the 124,000,000 Protestants 9,088,000 are credited to the United States, and of these we are credited with 350,000, or one in every twenty-six. According to this same authority there are five denominations in the United States, each of which numbers more than we do; namely, in round numbers: Methodist Episcopal, North and South, 2,492,000; Regular Baptists, 2,102,000; Lutherans, 694,000; Presbyterians, 574,000; Congregationalists, 376,000. Thus it appears that in our numerical relations to the denominations as a whole, we are but a few and feeble folk, and that to several of the denominations taken singly, we are inferior.

2. OUR CHRONOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RELATIONS.—There is probably as wide a difference between our own view of our chronological and historical relations to the denominations and that which they commonly take of us, as there is between us and them on the question of our being a denomination. They consider that we took our rise only a little more than half a century ago, in Pennsylvania or Ohio, and that Alexander Campbell was our founder and leader. Hence it is that they insist, despite all our protests, that we *shall* wear his name. Whenever we consent to wear that name and refuse to receive into our fellowship those who refuse to wear it, and when in addition to this, we take Alexander Campbell as authority in matters of religious faith and practice, and refuse our Christian fellowship to those who will not concur and co-operate with us in these things, then will there be

reason for considering us as a sect, and for giving us the sect name of Campbellites. Meanwhile, we take the liberty of suggesting, that it seems a little ungenerous, to say the least, that simply because there are so many sects and so many people who are satisfied to be sectarians rather than simply Christians, we must be considered a sect too, and have a sect name given us, and that too by those who fail to point out the peculiarity of doctrine, tenet, faith or practice which makes us a sect. Still, may the love of Christ and of Christ's name ever forbid that we should so dishonor him as to be willing to wear the name of Campbell where only Christ's name should be heard. Campbell has not been crucified for us, and we have not been baptized either *in or into* the name of Campbell. Further, our love for the memory of an earnest, humble, but gifted Christian man, who now rests from his labors and whose works do follow him, who in his life would have felt it an indignity to his Master, that his Master's servants should be called by his name, must ever forbid our consenting to be called by the name of Campbell.

In contrast with the erroneous view of our origin, that I have given, our own view is, that the church of which we are members took its rise, not fifty years ago, but eighteen hundred and fifty years ago, eighteen centuries sooner than is generally supposed, not in Pennsylvania or Ohio, but in the city of Jerusalem, that Christ, not Alexander Campbell, was its founder and is now its head; and that the apostle Peter, not Alexander Campbell, was its first great preacher. We believe further that Christ founded but one church, and that to-day he recognizes but one church as his. If we are right, then, in this view of our origin and our relation to Christ, our relations to the denominations must necessarily depend largely upon the relations they sustain to Christ. It is important to bear in mind just here, that we speak of ourselves as a religious body, and of the denominations as religious bodies. We have said that Christ founded but one church. We believe he intended there should be but one church. If we are that church, it is evident that any body with which we may be compared, any body that sustains any other relation to us than that of identity, cannot be the body that Christ founded. Its genealogy must condemn it. Of all the millions of men in the world there is just one who sustains to me the relation of a natural brother, a brother in

the flesh; and there is, of course just one to whom I sustain that relation. Of all the women in the world there is but one who sustains to me the relation of a natural sister, and to whom I sustain the relation of a natural brother. No one may justly censure me as arrogant, bigoted, exclusive or uncharitable, because I do not take more into the number of my brothers and sisters. These relations are not by my *choice*, nor by the choice of my brother or sister. They are consequent upon the relations that we three sustain in common to others. The man is my brother, not because there is a family resemblance between him and me; not because our talents, tastes, sympathies, aims, desires or aspirations may be alike; not because our habits of thought or of life may be similar; not because our childhood was spent under the same roof, in the bosom of the same family; not because the same fond eyes that watched, with tireless solicitude, his development from infancy to childhood, and from childhood to youth, and from youth to manhood, watched mine also; not because the same loving hands that ministered to his wants ministered also to mine, or the same loving hearts that yearned for his welfare yearned also for mine. All these together would not make him my brother, nor make me his brother, though our hearts might be knit together as the hearts of David and Jonathan. He is my brother because he is the son of my mother and of my father, and I am his brother because I am the son of his father and of his mother. The woman is my sister because her parents are my parents; I am her brother because my parents are her parents. Destroy the relations that we in common sustain to the same parents, and you destroy the relations that we sustain to each other.

So it is with us and the denominations as religious peoples. If they, *as denominations*, sustain to Christ the same relations that we sustain to him, as a church, then our relations to the denominations are those of a sister church to sister churches, but if their organizations or bodies, do not sustain the same relations to Christ that ours does, then our relations to them are not what they would be on the first supposition. We claim that Christ is the founder of the church to which we belong, that he is the Father of the everlasting age. If he is also the founder and father of the denominations, our origin is common and "we be brethren."

But I do not understand that any one claims that Christ is

the founder of the denominations, as such. That he is the author of all the christianity there is in them, and that this is much, I have no disposition to question, I would indeed earnestly maintain it. I understand it to be generally admitted by those who compose these denominations, that Christ is the founder of one body and but one. But, it is immediately added, the various bodies which we call denominations, taken collectively, constitute this one body, and taken singly they are branches of the one body. To say that this is naked assumption, and that there is not one word of support for it in all the Book of God, seems to me to be in perfect accord with the truth. Certainly no one will claim that the Methodist Episcopal church and the Baptist church are one and the same body, or that either of these bodies is identical with the Church of England, or that any two, of the more than a hundred religious bodies which might easily be named, are identical with each other. But I am reminded that it is not claimed that they are one and the same body. I answer: They have not the connection and sympathy with each other that show them to be branches of the same body. The Methodist Episcopal churches in Chicago have such connection, sympathy, and coöperation with the M. E. churches in Cincinnati as show them all to be parts of the great Methodist body; and they rejoice in each other's success as Methodists: so of the Baptists; so of all the denominations; and so, also, of the church of Christ. If Baptists rejoice in the success of Methodists, they rejoice in their success not as Methodists but as Christians. The same is true of all denominations in general.

But when, by common consent, not one of these denominational bodies had been born, Christ said to his disciples, "I am the vine; ye are the branches." From this text it ought to be very evident that the denominations of our day are not the branches of the church of Christ, but that each individual disciple is a branch of the true vine. There is not an intimation in this text, nor in any other, that the denomination with which a disciple of Christ may by circumstances, whether under or beyond his control, happen to be identified, is a branch of the body of Christ.

If men may originate bodies, at pleasure, and call them churches of Christ or branches of Christ's church or of the church of God, why may not the Masonic, and Odd Fellow, and such like fraternities be recognized as branches of the church? True, Odd

Fellowship and Masonry are not identical, nor is either of these identical with any one of many other similar institutions. Still they include many members of the church, many Christians in their organizations. They hold and teach and practice many valuable truths and many principles that have their home in the bosom of God; and many of their members say, "Masonry is as good a religion as I want," "An Odd Fellow's lodge is as good a church as I need," &c., &c.

But again, before any denomination which now exists had come into being, the Holy Spirit said of Christ, that God "gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." And, that we might understand something of the relationship of the parts, branches or members of this body, it was said, under the sanction of the Holy Spirit, "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we [individual disciples] being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." Can it be said, for example, of the members of the Presbyterian church and the members of the Baptist church that they are "every one members one of another?" If they were members one of another in the same sense in which Presbyterians of the same kind, though in different parts of the world, are members one of another, it could be fairly claimed that the members, of the two denominations are all "members one of another." But once more in this line of thought: "As the body [the human body] is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ." "Now are they many members, [of the human body] yet but one body." "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." These texts seem abundantly to show that the scriptures recognize but one body of Christ on earth, and recognize the individual members only of that one body as its branches.

In the long dark catalogue of the works of the flesh, given in the letter to the Galatians, "factions, divisions, heresies" or, as in the margin of the new translation, "parties" are included; and it is added: "They which do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God." There is quite as much scriptural authority and support for the idea that there are two, or an indefinite number of Gods, which together constitute the one true and living God; an indefinite number of Lords Jesus Christ, which collec-

tively constitute the one Lord; or an indefinite number of Holy Spirits, which taken altogether constitute the third person of the Godhead, as that there is or may be an indefinite number of religious bodies which collectively make up the one body or church of Christ. The bodies which are called the denominations of to-day took their rise long after the time of the beginning of the church of Christ, which beginning was to be and actually was in the city of Jerusalem. Most of these denominations had no existence at all for more than a thousand years after the Holy Spirit had said to the church of Christ, "Let there be no divisions among you."

Faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to him does not identify a man with any of the so-called branches of the church; does not make a man a Presbyterian, the Presbyterians themselves being the judges; or a Methodist, the Methodists themselves being judges; or a Baptist, the Baptists themselves being judges; does not, I insist, make him a member of any denomination. Yet this same faith and obedience is exactly what does make him a Christian, make him a member of the body of Christ, the church. And nothing short of this faith and obedience, so far as God has been pleased to reveal to us, does make a man a Christian, or identify him with the church of God. The injunction "Let there be no divisions among you," was to them who had become united by faith in Christ and obedience to him and among whom the only necessary bond of union was that same faith and obedience. Nor did this faith and obedience embrace a wider range of particulars as some may have been led to think. The faith required was neither more nor less than the belief of the gospel, and the obedience required was the obedience of the gospel. When Christ was about to leave the world, having already demonstrated his power over all the departments of nature, mineral, vegetable, animal, human, spiritual, and even over death itself, assuring his ambassadors now that all authority in heaven and on earth was given into his hands, he commissioned them to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, adding, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Paul, who supposed himself "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles," said afterwards, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." To every one that believeth, not some

dogma; some theological system of the dark or any other ages; or some speculation, deductions or philosophies on which a denomination may be founded; but to every one that believeth the gospel which Christ commanded to be preached, and to the belief and obedience of which he annexed the promise of salvation. This gospel Paul declares to be the very gospel which he himself preached, the gospel which his converts received, in which they stood, and by which they were saved, if saved at all. He then plainly declares that what he preached for the gospel was this: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures, and that he was seen of many witnesses, of whom he himself was one. His statement then, of what the Gospel is, is plain, simple, and easy of comprehension.

The next inquiry is, What was the *obedience* of the Gospel, which we have said was a constituent element of the bond of union among those who were not to be divided? Paul tells us in the sixteenth chapter of Romans, that God had revealed, in his day as we must infer, a mystery which had been kept secret since the world began, that he had commanded it to be made known to all nations, and that the end sought by the revelation and promulgation of the mystery was "the obedience of faith." This mystery was, that it was God's purpose that the Gentiles should be made fellow-heirs with the Jews, and of the same body, and partakers of the promises of God in Christ by the gospel. In the same connection he speaks of God as having power to establish men according to the gospel which he preached, and the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery. We have already seen that when Christ, in giving the commission, commanded the gospel to be preached, he enjoined baptism upon the believer, as an antecedent to salvation, as an antecedent to being established, if you please, according to the gospel. This baptism is an act of obedience, of obedience too founded on faith in the gospel, or, more properly, on faith in the author of the gospel. This act of obedience must therefore necessarily be subsequent to that faith on which it rests; and although baptism is the one single act of obedience mentioned in the commission, it at least by implication commits its subject to a life of obedience to Christ. Faith in Christ is the faith whose obedience is mentioned in Romans 16:26,

and since this faith is the same as the belief of the gospel in the commission which Christ gave, we conclude that the obedience which follows the faith of Rom. 16, is the baptism which follows the belief of the commission. Hence it appears that the belief of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, according to the scriptures, and baptism upon this belief, constitute the attraction which brought together, and the bond which held united in one body such as became disciples of Christ. Accordingly we read in the history of the growth of the church, that "The word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to this faith."

OUR STRUCTURAL AND DOCTRINAL RELATIONS.—Under this head a few words concerning the foundation, the materials, and the manner of combining them in the body with which we are identified, in contrast with the corresponding elements of the denominations, will still further illustrate our relations to the denominations.

Concerning the foundation of this church, as we understand it, it was written about seven hundred and fifty years before the church was established, "Thus saith the Lord, behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation." And again, prophetically, it was said, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes." That these passages refer to Christ is made certain by such expressions of the New Testament scriptures as these: "If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious, to whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scriptures, Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." When Peter had avowed to Christ his belief, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God," Christ replied, "Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." It is disputed whether this declaration of Christ means the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church or against the foundation truth on which that church should rest. But, however this

may be, certain it is that that foundation truth is, that Jesus is the Christ the son of the living God.

In accordance with the prophecy that God would lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, &c., &c., after Christ had been tried, and proved himself conqueror even of sin, of death, and of the grave, it was proclaimed in Zion that God had made him both Lord and Christ, and exalted him with his own right hand to be a Prince and a Savior to grant repentance and remission of sins to Israel. And on the same day, without any protracted meeting, or mourners' bench, or vociferous prayers for the coming of the Holy Spirit, there were built into the church, upon this simple foundation, three thousand souls. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ;" that is, the foundation of the church, known to the apostles, is that Jesus is the Christ; and no man can lay any other foundation for Christ's church, however many foundations may be laid for however many other churches. "To the Christians at Ephesus Paul says, "Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." This is the only foundation upon which the church referred to by the word *our* in my subject, is built; and this church is the only one known to me which has no other foundation. I do not mean, however, to be understood that the churches called denominations are built or supposed to be built without Christ in them; but I do mean to insist that if, in their foundations, they laid no other stones but the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, the foundations would all be alike: and, so far at least as the foundations are concerned, there could be no divisions into Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Episcopalian, Baptist, Methodist, &c., churches. God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles recognize nothing in the foundation of the church beyond what has been indicated in the quotations already given.

But when one has been built upon this foundation, he is, in virtue thereof, surely, neither of the Roman Catholic, Greek, Episcopalian, Baptist, nor any other denomination.

But, leaving the foundation, what shall we say of the material? We may truly say this much, at least: that material

which is fit to be built upon the foundation which God laid in Zion, is often, indeed I think I may say, generally considered not fit to be built upon the foundations of the denominational churches. And, on the other hand, material that is fit to be built into many of the denominational churches is often totally unfit to be built into the church which Christ established.

The one peculiarity of our plea which embraces all the supposed peculiarities by which as a religious people we are distinguished from the denominations; or, as they would put it, from the other denominations, is that we insist upon a return in all matters of religious faith and practice to the faith and practice of the Apostolic Church, especially in all those things which are to be made binding upon the consciences of men, and conditions of their fellowship with us. This position at once excludes all infantile material and all unbaptized material, as we understand the scriptures. We hold and teach that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth it; and that every one who does heartily believe it, and desires to obey it, is a fit subject to be built into the church of God; that none who are incapable of believing it, that none who do not believe it, however capable, and that none who do believe it, yet who do not desire to obey it, are fit to be built into Christ's church. To those who do believe the gospel, which we have had defined above by Paul, and ask: "What shall we do to be saved?" we reply, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Thus are they brought into the church of God; but, as we believe, into no denomination. What is necessary in addition to this to connect one with a denomination is just what we are not conscious of having done, and what we have not intended to do; hence we live in the conviction that we are not a denomination.

The mode which we practice of building upon the one foundation laid in Zion seems to us to be in exact accordance with the language of Christ to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The *kingdom of God* here we understand to be but another name for the church of God. Our manner of building upon the one foundation is also in accordance with Christ's language in the commission, "He that believeth and

is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned ;" and with Paul's language, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the one body, being many, are one body : so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Nothing can be clearer than that in Paul's view of the case, all the members of Christ's body have come into it by being baptized into it. So we conclude that the material of which the church of Christ is composed, consists of those who with faith in Christ and repentance toward God have been baptized in the name of Christ. Every such person we believe to be, so long as he continues in the fear of God, a child of God, a brother of the Lord Jesus Christ, and a member of his body, the church.

But in many of the denominations we find those who do not believe and who have never believed the Gospel and who have never been baptized. We find many others who have believed the Gospel, a few of whom have never been baptized, nor received any substitute for baptism, but most of whom think they have been baptized, because in their infancy, without any faith, knowledge, or volition of their own, or, in later years, at their own option and by their own desire, they have had water sprinkled or poured upon them, and have been taught to regard this as baptism. So long as their faith is strong, I do not marvel that their conscience is at ease. Saul of Tarsus once verily thought with himself that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, and so, shutting up the saints in prisons, and giving his voice against them when they were put to death, punishing them oft in every synagogue, and compelling them to blaspheme, with exceeding madness he persecuted them even unto strange cities. His conscience was as good and as much at ease then as when, at the end of a long, active, and wonderfully efficient service in building up the faith which he once so zealously destroyed, he could say in his prison home, when he was patiently waiting the day of his execution, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith : henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me at that day." But his good conscience did not make him a child of God and build him into God's spiritual temple either when it was in error or when it rested in the truth of God. God's

power to salvation is not a good conscience, it is the Gospel. To that we must yield our credence, to that our obedience, if we would be saved. Popular denominational teaching seems quite to the contrary. Here is a sample: "With regard to the Holy Spirit and the Word * * * * we believe that only the direct agency and effectual working of the Holy Spirit in the sinner's heart can so convince him of his sin, or so reveal Christ to him, that he is made willing to forsake sin or to rely on Christ for salvation. We believe that the Holy Spirit commonly uses the word of truth as his instrument and means in turning the sinner's heart to God, * * * * that there is an influence of the Spirit, internal, mighty, efficacious, differing from moral suasion, by which the sinner is turned from the love and service of sin, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus. * * * We believe that regeneration is the sovereign act of the Holy Spirit, conversion being that same act, viewed from the human side, and considered as the turning of the heart with all its powers to God. We consider conversion, therefore, to be logically the result and consequence of regeneration. We do not identify baptism with regeneration or consider baptism in any sense the completion of the new birth. Rather must the new birth be a completed thing before the believer has a right to be baptized. Baptism, therefore, is not essential to justification or acceptance with God. Christian love and joy, a heart freed from the burden and guilt of sin, the gift of the Holy Spirit with all his enlightening, comforting, sanctifying influences—in fine, all that belongs essentially to the experience of the Christian, may be enjoyed by the believer so soon as he is a believer, whether he be baptized or not." Christ says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and Peter, acting under Christ's authority, says, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." But this denominational teaching says, You must be in the kingdom of God before you are born of water, and your sins must be forgiven before you are baptized.

Another example of denominational teaching: "The Gospel is necessary, though of itself insufficient to renew and sanctify the depraved hearts of men. The Gospel is necessary, though alone it cannot purify man. The truths of revelation are not sufficient to save men. The Word of God, without the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, which is distinct from it, and operates

independently of it, has no power to save. Without this abstract influence of the Holy Spirit, the Word of God is a dead letter." Now let us put these several statements side by side with scripture statements, and in the fear of God, choose between them.

1. "The Gospel is necessary, though of itself insufficient to renew and sanctify the depraved hearts of men."—Denominationalism. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."—Paul. Is the power of God that saves men insufficient to renew and sanctify the depraved hearts of men? Then may we well despair of their being renewed and sanctified. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth,"—Jesus.

2. "The Gospel is necessary, though alone it cannot purify man."—Denominationalism. "Having purified your souls in obeying the truth [the Gospel], through the Spirit to unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently."—Peter. "God * * * put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith [faith of the Gospel]. —Peter.

3. "The truths of revelation are not sufficient to save men."—Denominationalism. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Christ. The man that is free from sin is a saved man.

4. "The Word of God, without the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, which is distinct from it, and operates independently of it, has no power to save."—Denominationalism. "Call for Simon, whose surname is Peter, and he shall tell thee words [the words of God, the words of the Gospel], whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved."—An angel. "In whom [Christ] ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation."—Paul. "From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."—Paul.

5. "Without this abstract influence of the Holy Spirit, the Word of God is a dead letter."—Denominationalism. In the New Testament Scriptures, we read not a word of the Holy Spirit's operating independently of the Word of God, of the abstract influence of the Holy Spirit, &c.; but we do read, "The Word of God is quick [living], and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged

sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." We differ from all the denominations holding such views as are quoted above from denominationalism and agree with the scriptures. We accept the revelations and instructions which the Holy Spirit has given to us in intelligible human language, as recorded in the word of truth, the gospel of our salvation. We do not, while practically rejecting or overlooking these, call upon God and Christ and the Holy Spirit to give us any new revelations, any new miracles, any new assurances of God's love and mercy. We ask not God to give us further assurances of pardon and acceptance with him, while we refuse to accept the assurances he has already given, which we consider abundant and all-sufficient. So it is seen there are wide differences between us and the denominations in regard to the foundation, to the materials, and to the manner of working them into the spiritual building of God, the church. To express in a single sentence our relations to the denominations, we may say, that we sustain to them the relations of a divinely authorized religious body to those that are not only not divinely authorized, but whose very existence is condemned in the divine oracles.

But how ought we to be affected toward the denominations by these differences? Some one has said that "men are more inclined to hate each other for points on which they differ, than to love each other for points on which they agree" Let us not cherish an unkind or an unchristian feeling or desire toward a single one of the denominations, or toward a single member of any of them. While we think we stand, let us take heed lest we fall. While we condemn denominationalism and the spirit of sect, let us beware lest we ourselves manifest that spirit. "Are we better than they?" By no means, if we speak of our personal desires and purposes, piety and consecration. If we have a better understanding of God's truth in some points than we think the denominations have, we ought to be all the more humble, and devoted, and loving, and tender, and courteous. Certain it is that the denominations in general are wrong in holding and insisting upon those things which make them denominations, or we are wrong in condemning and opposing the denominations. If we replace the appointments of God with the appointments of men, let us remem-

ber that God has said: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." If we exclude from our church fellowship those whom God does not exclude from his church, or if we include in our church fellowship those whom God does not exclude from his church, or if we include in our church fellowship those whom God excludes from his church, we are to that extent as much a denomination as any denomination in the world. I maintain my connection with the church with which I am identified rather than with any other, not because there are not just as good men and women in other churches, not because it is a matter of my own preference, but because it is a matter in which I have no choice but the will of God. If our separate existence as a distinct religious people, that is, distinct and separate from the religious denominations of the day, is not required by the word of God and the present state of the religious world, then it would please me to see that separate existence yielded up this hour, and to know that the number of christian sects has been reduced by one at least, and that one ours. If it is a matter simply of human preference, and not of divine authority, where we hold our church membership, let us hold it with the most numerous Christian body in the world, the Roman Catholic church; so that, as far as we are concerned, the world may not still go on stumbling into eternal ruin over the divided and distracted state of the church.

I would not be understood in anything that I have said as intimating, assuming or holding, that there are not very many Christians who are identified with the denominations. But the fact that Christians are identified with the denominations does not make the denominations themselves branches of the church of Christ. I fully believe, also, that many in the denominations who are not Christians in the full New Testament sense of the word, have the desire and the determination above everything else to be Christians. In this state of things there is hope for a better. Let us, then, pray and work for the speedy coming of that joyful day when every one who is now dividing his energies and his love between the church of God and any denomination, adopting the sentiment,

"Man-like is it to fall into sin,
Fiend-like is it to dwell therein,
Christ-like is it for sin to grieve,
God-like is it all sin to leave,"

shall hear the voice of the Heavenly Father, calling to his children in Babylon, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

A. J. THOMSON.

GOD'S TOUCH DIRECT TO-DAY.

"The child is father to the man," yet the child, as such, knows not the sublime potentialities that may lie hidden in the seed-bed of its own soul; often even shunning, as aliens and enemies, the strong light and heat and the beating rains of needed discipline and development.

We, in the childhood of a religious movement which may yet prove the grandest in all history, since the glory of the Apocalypse crowned the story of the suffering Son of God, cannot in the very nature of things, realize the true measure and grandeur of our work, with all its hidden possibilities and all its growing necessities.

Yet, as teachable and diligent school-going little children, thrilled with aspiration by glorious glintings of prophecy from within and from without, which tip our schoolward walks as with living gold, we may surely grow unto a proud and splendid future, wide with leafy grandeur and rich with golden fruitage.

To this end we, as a people, have some things to learn and somethings to unlearn.

Our Plea is not a merciless iconoclasm, a fierce and implacable antagonism to the ripest and best thought in the believing world around us; in a word not a constant pomp and menace of battle, proud with the rush of war-steeds and the glitter of sweeping sabres. On the contrary, it has borrowed much of its strength and beauty from its surroundings, and to-day reflects the deep, underlying God-implanted hunger after Truth and Unity, which has pervaded the whole line of true, believing hearts from the days of the apostles till now.

Regarding Our Plea, then, not as the foe, but the true friend and helper of the religious world around us, when that plea is faithfully and lovingly presented, we esteem one thing especially needful at this juncture, to fully meet this sublime situation. It

is this, namely: a clear, distinct, and hearty recognition, on the part of our people generally, of the truth that God in His love and helpfulness, to-day, directly impresses hearts and lives and their environments. This truth, though generally recognized in the religious world, is as generally associated with error.

By a more general and hearty recognition of this truth, on our part, minus the errors that deform it, we shall be placed nearer to the great heart of the believing world around us, closer to the bosom of all suffering humanity, and more surely within the sweet solace and the clear simplicity of God's written word.

By direct Divine impressions or touches to-day, we do not mean law-disturbing, miracle-working movements of Divine power, but simply the lawful and necessary exercise of personal Divine influence to wise and helpful ends, as will hereafter appear.

But the truth referred to, many of us are illy prepared to accept; fear, a cunning Delilah, and Satan's prime minister, sternly forbidding—the fear of bolstering up false theories of conversion. In this fear, strangely confounding word and spirit, to our religious neighbors, many of us have seemed to ignore altogether the real influence of the Divine Spirit of to-day.

Of this haunting fear, a worse than Hamlet's ghost, some of us, also, deny to prayer all objective force; thereby, to the writer's mind, making it an empty nothing, though leaping in warm and holy fervor from burning tongues of agony, or from the impearled and crimson portal of child or maiden's pure, sweet lips. From this weak, fear-begotten denial of direct Divine influence, to-day, even in answer to prayer, we instinctively and constitutionally recoil. To us it is a wretched, base-born mockery of gospel truth, whose beggarly tatters flap and flaunt in the face of dear old memories of holy dead ones; whose lives were made grand, heroic and blessed, by a sure confidence in God's direct, immediate help. We cannot think God, to-day, a stony fixedness, who works only by proxy, through iron laws, the "overseers" of nature's slavery. The grasp and compass of our mind is not equal to that advanced deep-thoughtedness, which can pray to God, and yet heroically reject the bald, blank, bootless hope of moving His heart and hand a single hair's-breadth, beyond the dull, inglorious routine of a possible and petrified plan. When we can own prayer a blind, objective falsehood; when we can make it a pantomimic abortion,

a pyrotechnic flash and emptiness, as it leaps forth from burning depths of human consciousness, and shoots straight God-ward through the outer vastness; then we shall confess the Bible a fable, and the soul itself a naked, empty lie.

"But hold, hold," cries one, my friend, my brother, "argument, argument, sir, not fancy or invective, would be in point right here; and now, as the objective force of prayer would seem to demand miracle-working, and as God works miracles no more, must we not deny such force to prayer?"

Well, my brother, despite the empty terrors of that fearful name, miracle, the sober, solid fact remains that God to-day both hears and answers prayer. If this, His daily work, demands the miraculous, then, for us, as for God's ancient Israel in the Wilderness, the grandest miracles are daily wrought.

Better, surely, dear brother, the spontaneity, the freshness, and the sweetness of holy helping miracles, than the utter staleness and flatness of machine prayers, and their machine answers.

But let us weigh for a moment, in a calm, discriminating manner, the thought that prayer is wholly subjective, and works no objective good whatever.

By the "subjective" power of prayer is usually meant, neither more nor less, than the inner satisfaction and the resultant peace and comfort of our reciting our wants and woes to a sympathizing God.

But Bible-taught prayer is not a bare recital in the ear of God; it involves, also, earnest petition for help, for objective good. As aiming to obtain such good, the praying one can find no subjective peace and satisfaction in the recital of his woes and needs, only as he believes that the objective good sought—the burden of his prayer—will be divinely given or its equivalent supplied. Thus upon the theory that prayer has no objective force at all; the subjective peace and comfort thereof, in the light of the fact just given, are made to depend on the belief of a falsehood, upon the pious potency of a venerable and mossy delusion.

True, a human soul may find comfort and satisfaction in simply reciting its needs and troubles, in the ear of another and sympathizing soul which may be utterly unable to give it help. But until believers are fully prepared to regard God after the fashion of

a warm-hearted, but impotent mortal friend; they cannot find holy peace and comfort in the bare recital of their troubles to Him.

Further, when they come to the point of regarding God as thus powerless, though they may, in nominal prayer, *soliloquize* before God about their trials and needs; yet they will certainly not venture upon the supreme folly of *petitioning* Him for anything.

What is prayer without petition? *What is it?* Echo is palsied, or dead and answers not. Examine well your moorings and foundation, dear brother, before you suffer yourself to finally rest in that philosophy which makes prayer a hollow mockery, and which robs God of all present and operative omnipotence, to make His sympathy even impotently available. Prostrate and bleeding in dark cells of cruel want and woe, thousands of believing hearts are daily beating the ice-gorged bars of their prison walls, amid the hoarse thunders of crashing ice and madly swelling waters, as they plead with God for a helping hand beyond themselves. At the bare thought of mocking such helpless hearts of woe, with a cold and barren human philosophy; with anything, indeed, short of a plain "thus saith" the Almighty God, Himself; let our hearts sink in crimson blushes, sunset clouds of shame; ending their little day of foolish, philosophic (?) pride, in the coward shades of conscience-gendered night.

Doubtless you have learned, my brother, to think a direct touch of God on mind or matter, a miraculous, and, to-day, a scripturally and logically forbidden thing.

But is all this true? Let us see. What is a miracle as related to the established order of things? It is certainly an effect of the direct Divine touch or impress somewhere upon that order.

As God, however, is god of law and order, and essentially and eternally so, this effect must perfectly consist with law and order, in Himself, at least, and it must violate law and order nowhere in His universe. That which perfectly agrees with law and order in God Himself, and which violates law and order nowhere, however unusual and extraordinary it may be, is certainly a logically admissible thing even to-day. Miracles, then, are never logically forbidden, if occasion demand them.

But is not every direct touch or influence of God upon mind or impure matter a miracle? We think not. To our mind the

essence of the miraculous modal, not dependent on the direct as opposed to the indirect exercise of Divine power; but is altogether in the effect wrought. If that effect be a thing or state of things to the production of which the established order of nature is manifestly unequal, not only at the time, but for all time, then the effect wrought is certainly miraculous.

If on the other hand, the effect of a direct exercise of Divine power on mind or matter, be the production of an event or state of things, by no means peculiar, unusual or extraordinary as related to the productive capacity of natural law and order, such things or state of things, is clearly not miraculous. However peculiar, extraordinary and even instantaneous such a direct Divine influence may be, yet so long as its effect, as an effect simply, remains such an effect as may and does otherwise occur in the natural course of things; this effect is not and cannot be miraculous.

The logical possibility of a non-miraculous, yet direct Divine touch, to-day, a touch producing even extraordinary and instantaneous effects, yet agreeing with established law and order, has now, we trust, been made sufficiently apparent. The reality and necessity of such influence, to-day, now demands our attention.

The reality of a direct divine touch or influence on both mind and matter to-day is to our mind logically demanded by these two things especially, namely, the divine veracity and the liberty of Himself and His people.

Our position is simply this: That God has taught His people to look and to pray for a promised help and comfort, which in view of the contingencies pertaining to all conceivable finite liberty, and in view of the demands of divine liberty itself, cannot be given without the employment on God's part of direct influence on mind and matter for all time.

God has made to His people precious and unalterable promises of both general and particular, ordinary and special care, help and comfort. His people are a morally free people; and their moral freedom as finite beings, implies contingency, uncertainty, as respects their moral choices—that they may or may not choose and do thus or thus.

Contingency as respects choice implies more or less contingency in the things and relations pertaining thereto; and as these are correlative to others, to a universal chain of correlations; con-

tingency in a greater or less degree is implied as pervading the universe. This contingency of things implied in free choice must be real, not seeming contingency, merely that free choice may be truly free.

Contingency, then, is found in all nature as a legitimate part of the whole, and as a necessary relation of all finite moral freedom. Present exercise of divine liberty, as well as that of human liberty demands some *bona fide* contingency of things in nature. If the present order of things were absolutely fixed in all possible relations and details of movement; then there would be no room for the present exercise of free choice on the part of God, in its government and direction.

Present, active and efficient liberty both human and divine, therefore, stand or fall together.

By moral liberty we do not mean, (note this especially) as the words are often made to mean, the liberty to choose either good or evil, indifferently; as we cannot conceive of a moral being having any such liberty, or making any such choice. By moral liberty we mean the liberty, the ability to make such intelligent choice between good and evil, as places volition freely, unhesitatingly on the side of the good; in a word the uncompelled ability to choose and to do the good, the right with a whole-minded choice. Inducement or temptation to evil is not an essential element of moral freedom, as such, inasmuch as God is morally free, yet cannot be "tempted of evil."

Such susceptibility of temptation in the case of man, therefore, is properly no part of his freedom at all, but a simple limitation of his faculties as a finite being. If he knew all things he could not be tempted of evil, yet would be morally free.

If God be morally free, as He certainly is, in the true conception of moral liberty, then His moral liberty, His absolute power to choose and to do the good, the right, is His chief attribute.

A supreme moral being without the supreme qualification of such liberty, in and with which to exercise all His other attributes, is to our mind logically inconceivable.

If moral liberty be the chief attribute of God, it is the same of His offspring, men and angels. It is, therefore, the mainspring of all intelligent activities throughout the universe, and as such must be in constant and ceaseless play. This ceaseless play of universal

moral liberty demands a ceaseless play of contingencies ; and this in turn demands a ceaseless play of direct and free volition wherever voluntary beings are found in the universe ; and as God is everywhere, His free and direct volition must be everywhere, every hour.

God, the Supreme Freedom, to His free children, has made promise of constant care and help. These children are beset with million-fold contingencies which they can neither measure nor control.

They constantly exercise their freedom, but almost always in a more or less mistaken way ; owing to their finite limitations of fear, doubt and ignorance. Thus a constantly working human freedom, with its finite limitations, makes a constant demand and necessity for the direct and unceasing play in nature, here or there as occasion requires, of divine power, in fulfillment of its promised care and help.

We have now shown, we think, in some measure, however small and feeble it may be, that the divine veracity and the liberty of Himself and His people justify and require the thought of His touch direct to-day.

"But God is infinite in knowledge," interposes my brother, "and foreknowing all things, surely nothing can be contingent to Him." We reply that neither fore nor after-knowledge changes the essential nature of things, but on the contrary must conform thereto. Contingencies, therefore, are foreseen and foreknown of God as contingencies, not otherwise. Contingencies often become actualities it is true ; but this change is itself always a contingency and is foreseen of God as such. In brief, what God has absolutely pre-determined, that and that only is absolutely certain to transpire ; while whatsoever He has not thus pre-determined is contingent, uncertain. To say, therefore, that God foreknows all things is only to say that He knows, ever did, and ever will know precisely what He Himself has pre-determined, and precisely what He has not pre-determined. This, and not the contradiction and absurdity of fore-knowing contingencies as absolute certainties, it is, that the infinity of the divine knowledge, together with the "eternal now" of His chronology, require us to think and believe. It is God's infinite ability and liberty to control all things, real

contingencies included, which make Him God, indeed, immeasurable, unfathomable, in His freedom, might and knowledge.

Let us now take man, the image of God, in illustration of our subject. Between man's body and spirit there is mutual sympathy and re-action. This sympathy and re-action is pervasive of man's whole being and is often intensely so. Thus the activities and energies of body and spirit seem to permeate each other, and to interfuse the one with the other, yet the identity of neither is lost or impaired.

In human volition there is somewhere, be it in the brain or elsewhere, a direct touch of the human spirit upon the physical forces of its animal organism. This touch, though direct, and, in its influence, pervasive often of man's whole animal economy, even to the production of very unusual, extraordinary and instantaneous results, is never esteemed miraculous.

Again, man is a free being who makes provision for himself and others. This he does mainly through the medium of his body, making through this medium instant and extraordinary provision for emergencies and urgent wants, as well as regular provision for regular wants. In all this nothing miraculous is seen, for all is according to the common course of free volition wielding its bodily instrument.

Now let it be supposed that God and created things, the latter closely embraced by his all-surrounding spirit, act and re-act upon each other in mutual sympathy and with a pervasive force and energy; and let it be supposed that His free volition directly touches and plays upon the forces of nature, as man's volition touches and plays upon his own physical energies. With these things supposed, can we not also suppose the most instant and extraordinary manipulation of natural forces on the part of the divine free-will, to meet urgent human wants and necessities, without supposing a miracle in the case; no law being superseded or for a moment set aside, but on the contrary, the chosen and ever responsive instrument of the Divine free will, being lawfully subjected to instant and special Divine use.

Where then is the prime difficulty or error relating to this confessedly deep and hard question of Divine and Natural relations?

We think it consists, mainly, in the mental separation between

the Divine Spirit and His created works; a separation for which necessitarian theology, is perhaps, as much or even more responsible than unbelieving physical science. Finished mechanism passes from the hands of its maker to other hands to be operated and controlled. Under the necessitarian mechanical conception of created things, therefore, nature has been turned over from the hands of its creator, to physical laws and forces, for its government and control; and the present care and attention of the author of nature, under this view, becomes a needless interference. On the other hand Creation viewed as a living, growing, re-productive work, even as the garden of God, necessarily demands His constant care and supervision; His direct touch and manipulation for all time.

Necessitarian (that is the right word) theology, which is philosophy idealizing facts; while not denying all manner of present, personal Divine efficiency in nature; yet has God working, to-day, an ideal garden absolutely fixed and settled, by a previous plan, in all the details of its progress and development. This makes both God and Nature mechanical in all their movements to-day. This ideal philosophy of religion knows only an ideal liberty antedating the present order of things. The moment it steps from the plane of the ideal to that of the actual, it bids a hollow and sepulchral farewell to liberty with all the thrilling charms of its warm, fresh and peerless beauty.

But we are writing for those especially, who recognize in some degree the liberty of both God and man to-day. If these will not separate in thought between God and His created works, but will preserve the most intimate logically possible relations between them, difficulties will measurably vanish and the vision grow clearer.

Another illustration of the intimate relation between God and Nature, and especially of the responsiveness of the latter, and we shall draw to a close. All nature, all created material existence, is one vast organ, the sounding keys of which receive the touch of God, of Satan, and of man. To fixed laws of sound and touch each player's stroke upon its yielding keys is conformed; yet each is free, according to his capacity and within the infinite sweep and compass of the possibilities of sound and touch, to play just as he wills. What airs are played by hands human and hands satanic, too, upon this mighty organ's wondrous keys, and oftentimes, alas!

with dark and damning touch! Then, oh God, what fearful bursts of pain and woe the madly struck and quivering keys give forth. Hark! how the organ shrieks and wails. See, see it drips with blood and tears at every key. But hark again! another touch is there, of white and glistening fingers, whose living beams light blood and tears with glory all divine; while through each wail and shriek is struck a trembling, thrilling chord of tender love, which hushes all, then swells victorious a diapason deep and grand of joy and peace sublime. It is the hand of God upon the ready willing keys, that know His master-stroke of old.

"Ah, this is poetry rather than logic," sighs my brother. Well, be it so, since all love is poetry, and God is love. The logic then to God most true, lives, burns with the sacred fire of poesy. What, my brother, is nothing logical which is not meanly cold, and hard, and dry? Confesses logic only the stones and chips of human thought? Scouts the true logical olfactory only the horrid grinning skeleton, or the dried old mummy in his forgotten grave? Give me the logic that glistens in the eye and warms from crown to foot at the kiss of poesy, only to hew with a prouder flash and ring to his flying axe. Such a logic—not the dried and shriveled living death of cloistered walls, but the hale, fresh and wholesome logic of God, heaven-taught from Eden to Calvary, and from Calvary to Patmos, and dashed all the way through with the gleam of living waters and the breath of perennial flowers—this logic justifies and even demands the thought that both mind and matter are directly impressed to-day with the efficacious touch of God, especially in answer to naked human need, trembling, fainting on pallid lips of prayer.

But here my brother interposes thus: "Viewing God in all the liberty and in all the intimate relations to His work which you have described, how are we to distinguish between an effect of the non-miraculous direct touch of God to-day, and a similar effect otherwise produced in the natural course of things, since as effects simply they are of one common kind by your own admission?"

We answer, we are so to distinguish, not by sight, for God and His influences as such are invisible; not by feeling, for feeling apprehends effects purely as effects, discovering not their causes; but by faith and only by faith are we to distinguish one of these from the other.

"Where then, the advantage in the view proposed?" still queries my brother.

We reply that whatsoever helps to enlarge human conceptions of the glory of God; whatsoever tends to dignify and ennoble human nature; whatsoever widens and deepens faith itself, is practically and immensely advantageous to believe, as compared with that which dwarfs and cripples each and all of these.

Now it is humbly, yet sincerely and strongly believed, that the foregoing views of Divine influence, tend to more exalted conceptions of the excellence of both the Divine and the human natures, and also tend to enlarge and to ennoble a weak and wavering faith, shaken by "science falsely so-called," or by neglect of duty.

Surely, any scheme of thought which makes God a living, loving nearness, sweet and grand, full of patient watchfulness and tender care, and unspeakably rich with helpfulness in the unabated glory of His eternal God-hood; surely any such scheme, to needy and suffering souls, at least, is advantageous.

On the other hand, any necessitarian scheme of thought, whether scientific or religious, logically degrades both God and man, and deforms and cripples even a brave and vigorous faith, fresh and strong with stalwart manliness. On the same hand, any scheme of religious thought which makes sense-perceived—not faith perceived—Divine influences and manifestations a reality of to-day, is fearfully subversive of pure gospel faith, and is weak, cloudy, narrow and carnal.

We believe in direct Divine influences to-day, as we have presented them. We believe also in the gift of some measure of the Divine spirit itself to the true child of God, to-day; and we believe in conscious experiences of the workings of that spirit in the believer's heart. We *believe* in these things as devoutly as any, but we pretend not to know them by "sight," nor by "feeling," which exhibits not the causes of things, but only claim to discern by faith.

What we have written, therefore, has been penned to meet the bleak and barren frigidities of what we deem an icy, heartless logic; not with a line of thought appealing to that basement—cellar kind of faith which is ever beating its damp walls with a noisy outcry for visible and sensible Divine manifestations, but in the

hope of meeting that logic by a line of thought—making warm and earnest appeal to the rational side of faith—pure, simple, gospel faith.

Faith we count even greater than reason, and the utmost simplicity of faith logically possible in the light of God's word, we esteem the grandest endowment beneath the throne of God, and worth all the wealth, the pomp and the glory of all the earth.

W. B. GALLAHER.

CERTAIN ALLEGED IMMORALITIES OF THE BIBLE.

It has been long a fashion with propagandists of unbelief to inveigh, with much vehemence, against certain features of the biblical history and legislation, as utterly inconsistent with sound morals. It might be pertinent in dealing with objections of this character, to inquire into the nature and source of the ethical ideas entertained by men of the class referred to, with a view to determine their authority and value; but in this paper, nothing of the sort will be attempted. It is more to my present purpose to admit that the plea in question is not destitute of a certain sort of foundation in truth, and to state further, with perfect frankness, that it has not only afforded to scoffers an occasion to indulge their unworthy propensity with some show of reason, but that it has been also a source of serious perplexity to many devout Christians. In late years especially, attacks of this sort have become quite common. The age, it is usual to say, is one of free inquiry. The remarkable progress of physical science, and the general enlargement of our ideas concerning the material world, have had a tendency to diminish our reverence for the wisdom of past ages, and to encourage an overweening confidence in the speculations of our cotemporaries. The fact that certain men who have won great distinction as scientific investigators, are known to hold opinions contrary to the fundamental tenets of Christianity, has had a certain influence upon the popular minds, inducing a tendency, in many persons, to call in question the realities of faith, and to cherish, half-way, the expectation that, at no distant day, the whole subject of religion must be relegated to the domain of obsolete ideas. This mental attitude of doubts, and evil expectancy on the part of many, has greatly favored the circulation of skeptical literature. We may almost say that it seems as if a bureau had been organized for the creation and distribution of such a literature. Certainly, in our country there has been no time heretofore when

the measure of literary productiveness on the side of unbelief would compare with that of the period since our civil war. The seeds of doubt and denial have been scattered broadcast over the whole land. Our christian homes and hearths have been invaded. The social atmosphere has become surcharged with noxious influences. In such a case our duty, especially as christian teachers, seems to be plain. There must be no sacrifice of christian dignity, no imitation of the tactics of the opposition, no descent to the plane of the hustings, but at the same time the truth of God must not suffer rude assaults without finding earnest and competent defenders. The poison must be met with the proper antidote; not contemptuous sneers, nor personal vituperation, nor superficial diatribe; but honest, straightforward, convincing arguments. In such an encounter truth never suffers in the long run. The final triumph is certain, but meantime many may be led astray. To save those endangered by the fashion of the hour is an imperative duty. Able and true men have responded to this call of the Master, and a debt of gratitude is due to every one who has done real service to the cause of truth. But minds are diverse in organization and often made more so by long-continued habits of thought and action. What is potent with one is not always equally so with another; and unless I am mistaken, there remains a place for this essay. My desire is to do good. In any event I shall strive not to "darken counsel by words without knowledge."

I wish to establish at once a fair understanding with my christian readers. For while it is the object of this paper to deal with the cavils of unbelief, I greatly desire the sympathy and approval, as to my methods, of those who hold the common faith. But I cannot sacrifice truth for the smiles of men. I must be true to my own convictions, and discuss all questions that may arise from my own point of view. If this shall not always accord with your own, I hope you will none the less carefully consider whether I may not be right. If any traditionary theory which you have cherished should be quietly pushed aside to make way for something important in the discussion, I insist that you shall take no offense on that account.

It is never safe to enter the stadium carrying heavy weights. We must not affirm too little; neither should we seek to defend too much. What candid investigation has shown to be untenable,

I shall surrender without a moment's hesitation. Any dogma, or tenet, which refuses to harmonize with known facts, I shall consign to the limbo of exploded speculations and superstitions without a pang of regret. A ray of true light from the heresy-haunted halls of Tübingen shall be quite as welcome as if it came from Rome, or Geneva, or our own dearer Bethany. Weresoever found, by whomsoever spoken or written, truth is of God and shall live forever.

In this investigation it will be necessary to recognize the fact, that all Old Testament commands, institutions, revelations belonged to a period in which nothing had received its final shape; a period of incompleteness and preparation. That inspiration, so far from giving always the absolute truth, is often limited to imperfect, shadowy, and unsatisfactory glimpses of truth. That God can reveal to the world through any man only so much as he has succeeded in imparting to him.

The limitations both of time and personality must be duly considered.

The final revelations of the New Covenant were not possible in the period of Abraham or of Moses. Not every inspired man could be the equal of Isaiah, John, or Paul. The limitations of personality, not less than those of time, contributed to determine the height to which an inspired teacher might rise. Some men are born seers, and even without inspiration (in the biblical sense) see visions of beauty which to ordinary mortals lie far away in another world.

This fact holds good not only in the domain of poetry and art, but in the moral and spiritual realm as well. Throughout this essay these things will be kept constantly in sight, and much of what is to be written will take shape accordingly.

The inquiry about to be instituted will embrace the following topics: 1. The Exterminating Wars of Israel. 2. Polygamy. 3. Slavery. 4. The Imprecatory Psalms.

It is to these topics especially that the specious attacks of infidel propagandists relate, and to these it is desirable that a satisfactory treatment should be given. It would be unpardonable vanity to encourage the expectation of anything strictly new. The treatment must necessarily be brief. If any disciple of Jesus shall be made stronger, if any burdened soul shall be enabled to see his

way to the cross of Jesus, where burdens are no longer felt, it will be enough. A single soul saved from the dreary negations of unbelief will be a more than sufficient reward.

I. In any attempt to appreciate the facts of the Bible it is plain that the stage of civilization characteristic of the age, and of the peoples among whom the recorded events transpired, must be kept steadily in sight. To judge these ancient populations, by the moral standards of our times a standard, which is itself the product of many centuries of christian enlightenment, would be manifestly unfair and misleading. In dealing with man, Almighty God, failing of that which is perfect, has often had to rest content with that which was possible. To secure the best that is possible, in human conditions and without infringing upon human freedom, is itself a great achievement, even though it fall far short of absolute perfection. In the wars waged by ancient Israel we should not expect to find the humane usages of our christian civilizations. It was a rude age and the nations had barely started on the ascending plane. Alas! how painfully slow has human progress been! War, even in our own day, is scarcely less savage than in the rude ages so far away.

But the first thing to be clearly fixed in the mind, in this part of our inquiry, is the purpose of Jehovah in the call of Abraham, and the election of Israel as a theocratic people. In an attempt to judge the facts of the Bible we must postulate its fundamental ideas as the basis of investigation.

This is strictly logical. Now, according to both Testaments Jehovah intended in the call of Abraham and Israel to bestow an unspeakable boon upon the entire race. It was no narrow purpose, bounded by Canaan and Israelitish blood, but a vast and magnificent conception, embracing in its ultimate provisions all lands and all peoples. It took this comprehensive form in its very first announcement. "In you and in your seed," said God to the Patriarch, "shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

The elect family and nation, it is plain, were to be simply the instrument of a world-wide blessing. Before this calling and promise, and while he yet dwelt in Ur of the Chaldees, beyond the Euphrates, God had said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I will

show thee." And so he came, with Terah, his father, and Lot, his nephew, and dwelt for a time in Horan.

There Jehovah said to him more explicitly: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land which I will show unto thee; and I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This call out of Chaldea, and from beyond the Euphrates, is, in itself, most significant. If God's gracious purpose might have been accomplished as readily as elsewhere in Abraham's old home among the Chaldees, it is quite safe to say that the Patriarch would not have been required to undertake this pilgrimage. But Almighty God having chosen his man, must provide him a home which shall make possible the fulfilment of his destiny.

Thus the divine purpose begins to take shape in human history. In the time of Abraham, (in round numbers about 2,000 years before Christ), the peoples settled along the Euphrates must already have made very considerable progress in the acquisition of national solidarity and power. Already this most ancient civilization was beginning to give indications of the mighty renown which the future held in store for it. But the primeval monotheism which must have been the faith of their fathers had entirely disappeared, and polytheism and idolatry reigned in its stead.

Abraham's own father was a worshiper of idols, and the Patriarch himself, it is perfectly fair to presume, had been reared in the belief and cultus of his kindred. To attempt a general reformation was clearly a hopeless struggle. The people had not liked to retain God in their knowledge, and so he had given them up to walk in the devices of their own hearts. Henceforth, the march of their life must lead farther and farther away from the rejected truth. In such a social environment the new life of the theocracy could not be expected to survive.

In such a land, among such a people, it is not fit that the germ of a divine kingdom should be deposited. This fact makes clear the reason of the Patriarch's call to leave his country and his father's house, and journey to a distant land.

On the other hand, the region inhabited by the semi-barbarous

and grossly corrupt Canaanites was geographically, of all countries, the best adapted to become the centre of a faith which was destined to sweep over the world. Here was to be the great meeting point of nations, of civilizations, and of conflicting forms of philosophical and religious thought. Midway between the dreamy and luxury-loving populations of the Far Orient and the active, restless, indomitable races of the West, the new law, which, "in the fullness of the times," was to go forth from Mount Zion, might be soon carried to the outer limits of the civilized world.

Thus it is that in the call from Ur of the Chaldees and settlement in Canaan, we see the divine purpose beginning to manifest itself under the guiding control of the Divine Hand. Space and opportunity must be had for the slow growth of Jehovah's people, and for the slow, but steady, development of Jehovah's far-reaching and infinitely merciful purpose toward all mankind. What the land of the Chaldees denied was found along the shores of the Jordan, and about the beautiful lake, which has since become world-historical as the Sea of Galilee.

This region, sparsely populated by a number of strong tribes, or petty nations, in a state of constant warfare with each other, a fertile land, eligibly located as regards the growing civilizations of the earth, the reasons of the divine choice are surely not far to seek. The purpose of the Almighty to bless all the nations in Abraham and Israel, together with the transparent necessity for the removal from the shore of the Euphrates to Canaan, is thus firmly planted as the corner stone of the present discussion. This divine purpose must be realized as ever present in the history of the chosen people, so that whatever God does with them or through them is connected, either immediately or remotely, with this supreme end. It is only in the light of this comprehensive purpose that the history of Israel can be intelligently read, or the divine dealings with them appreciated or understood.

On the other hand, the Canaanitish peoples had forfeited their right under the divine government, to continued national existence. They had become hopelessly corrupt and degraded, and even by the ordinary law of God's providence over the world, their loss of national autonomy was, probably, a simple question of time. Wasting their strength and resources in petty conflicts with each other, after the inevitable fashion of those rude ages, they

would fall an easy prey to the first strong invader, whose lust of power should tempt him to come against them. God deals with nations as he does with individuals. •

Righteousness is evermore the sole title to his favor. And, if in organized human societies, the individual may forfeit his right to live, so, in the wider domain of the divine government, whole tribes and nations may lose their right to corporate existence. If human societies may protect themselves by taking away the life of an offender, when the common interest and welfare have been put in peril, why may not Almighty God remove whole nations from the earth, when his most gracious purposes are jeopardized by their presence? It is impossible to deny that he may. God had judged the idolatrous and corrupt Canaanites (as he had long before judged the ante-diluvian world) and had passed solemn sentence against them. The manner in which he executed his just sentence is the only important difference.

In this, there can be no ground for special complaint. When the state takes the life of an offender against the law, the sheriff who ties the fatal knot is no murderer. He does not violate the command which says: "Thou shalt not kill." When God passed sentence against the Canaanites, he made Israel his executioner. He, Himself, took all responsibility for the sentence. The mode of executing the sentence is, relatively, a matter of small importance.

The essential thing—and this is the second point in our argument—is, that the Canaanites, under the divine government, had forfeited their right to live. Let this fact be duly considered. Other people may have done the same thing, and may have been permitted to exist, because their existence did not interfere with the accomplishments of God's wise and merciful purposes. The argument has two sides, and both must be kept steadily in view. In this way only can the question be clearly comprehended.

I have spoken of the call of Abraham, and the reasons for his removal from the shore of the Euphrates to the land of Canaan. But it is clear that the divine purpose must fail if the Canaanites are permitted to abide in the land.

The choice is between practical extermination and failure. Israel is in Canaan, rather than Babylonia, to make the accomplishment of the divine purpose possible. The struggle for full

possession becomes inevitably, according to the ordinary course of things, a life-and-death conflict. Joint occupancy, as a permanent order, is clearly impossible. Sooner or later, one side must give place to the other.

The question of a nation's life, to the imperilled nation, is always the supreme question. A man may do things in self-defense, which, otherwise, he might not think of doing. All right-thinking people agree in this. The principle undoubtedly holds with nations as well. The nation's life is the supreme law. If a war of actual extermination is the unquestioned condition of a nation's life, then is such a war justifiable.

The nation's life is the highest law. We in America sympathize with Ireland. Doubtless we do well. English rule has not been to Irishmen an unmixed blessing. But by the law of her own safety England must maintain her supremacy in Ireland. The same law, long ago, made the conquest a necessity. An unfriendly nation at her very gates was a perpetual menace. England cannot now afford to let Ireland take her destiny in her own hands. The supreme question of national safety must determine her course. If, by some terrible convulsion of nature, the Green Island could be drifted, like a mighty iceberg, a thousand miles away, the case would be vastly different. Not some modified form of "Home Rule," but complete national autonomy might then be conceded without hazard. Short of this, the Irish question is not likely to be eliminated from British politics. And while it exists it must continue to be the most difficult practical problem that the British statesman encounters. Similar to this, but far more dangerous, was the relation of Israel to the Canaanites in the land.

It was a clear case of a life-and-death struggle between a people with a God-given destiny, in which the whole race was interested, and certain petty nations, wholly given up to idolatry, and otherwise grossly corrupt. What Israel must do is plain. Even without a direct divine warrant, the national life must be maintained, at whatever cost. It is no longer a question of mercy to heathen tribes, but one of simple self-preservation. There is not a civilized person on earth that would not act on the same general principle to-day.

From this point of view the problem, if not clear, is greatly

simplified. Israel must extinguish the Canaanite or perish by his hand. So much, at least, is plain.

Once more: Israel's fidelity to Jehovah, even granting the possibility of joint occupancy, was imperilled by the presence of the Canaanite in the land. The divine purpose could be fully accomplished only through Israel's witness against idolatry, and to the faith in the Living and True God. The isolation of Israel from idolaters was, therefore, an absolute necessity, and without the practical extinction of the Canaanites, and their cultus; such isolation was plainly impossible. The history of the chosen people was shaped by an imperious necessity which was many-sided in its character.

To the period of the great captivity, Israel was in constant danger of lapsing into idolatry. Not that he denied outright, at any time, his covenant with Jehovah, but he corrupted the true worship by introducing elements of the forbidden cultus; and, sometimes, by openly practicing the worship of foreign gods.

It is plain that Jehovah must hedge about his people, and make them, at any cost, distinct and peculiar, or fail to accomplish fully his purpose in calling them. The Canaanite, then, must not remain in the land. His substantial extermination from the stand-point of Israel's mission among the nations, is a simple necessity of Israel's history.

But this extinction of whole tribes was not to be effected at once, but by slow and certain methods, so that, in the execution of the divine sentence, there should appear, on the surface, as little deviation as possible from the ordinary course of human history. Apart from Jehovah's express command and certain miraculous interferences in Israel's behalf, the difference was not in the least discernible.

With these exceptions, we may, indeed say, there was no difference. An outside observer could have seen none. To such an one everything moved in the ordinary channels. It was the most common thing in the history of those far off centuries, a simple life-and-death struggle beteen neighboring peoples, and hostile interests and institutions. But beneath the entire series of events the Christian sees plainly the wise and beneficent purpose of the Infinite God, and the hand of His Providence shaping the course of human events, and securing amid the multifarious agencies and

conflicting interests of human life the accomplishment of a single predestined end.

To this supreme attainment, all else was subordinated, yet, man's freedom, in the wide field of his moral life, and spiritual relations, was nowhere, and at no time infringed.

I have said that God judged the Canaanites as he had formerly judged and sentenced the antediluvian world.

The difference in the two cases relates only to the manner in which the divine sentence was executed. In the case of the Canaanites the method was essentially the ordinary way of Divine Providence, differing, indeed, only in the fact of a revealed purpose and occasional extraordinary interference in Israel's behalf.

There is doubtless a special, and what may be called, for want of a better designation, an ordinary divine superintendence over the affairs of our world. Ordinarily, the divine method is that of simple law; of law so operating as to work out the divine purposes without a direct interference of the Divine Hand. All physical laws, all social and moral laws, are co-ordinated, let us believe under this supreme guiding principle. If the individual seeks happiness, he must seek it in righteousness, or fail to find it. Matthew Arnold is not talking heresy, but eternal truth, when he insists that "Righteousness is life," and that "Unrighteousness is death."

There is no wider or deeper truth known to mortal men. It is the expression of a fundamental law, graven in our nature, and in our whole environment, and certified to consciousness as a divine law, by the aggregated experiences of all individuals, in all ages. There is, indeed, an "Eternal Power, not ourselves, that makes for Righteousness." The ceaseless presence and operation of such a law is a sufficient guarantee of such a Power. Nations, no less than individuals, are amenable to this law, and must work out their destiny under it. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

By this law, God exalts one man, and debases another, every day. You have only to open your eyes to see that this is so. And though the view is wider, it is quite as easy to the practical observer, to trace the Divine Goings among the nations of the earth. God is hourly lifting up some nation, and debasing, nay, destroying others, by the quiet yet ceaseless operation of this inexorable law.

All history, which is only another name for the recorded experiences of the race, attest this conclusion. In the case of the Canaanites God departed from his usual method only in making known his will, and indicating the agency of Israel in carrying it out. Otherwise, there is no difference. With this exception, everything is cast in the usual mould of history. The sole difference is that which evermore obtains between the special and ordinary shaping of the divine ends.

In the case before us this difference is reduced to the minimum by the facts which have now been presented. It is simply the working out, under a special Divine Providence of the grandest final results, in harmony with the ordinary principles which guide the course of man's development, and shape the progress of his history.

If it be objected, that after all, the fact remains, that God is represented as giving the sanction of a positive command to the perpetration of most horrible cruelties, I reply that it was far better thus, than that Israel should be left to the perpetration of these same cruelties without a divine warrant. The divine command is indeed the only thing that seems strange, for otherwise, the conduct of Israel was in the ordinary and inevitable course of things.

But perhaps we do not notice the fact that the divine command was in the nature of a limitation. If the people were taught to expect divine guidance in their relations with the heathen around them, they would soon come to feel their dependence upon divine authority. It was easier to control them by the fear that God might not go with them to the battle than by an appeal to moral principle, or the promptings of humanity. To make them feel their dependence upon a divine command, was to take from them the notion that they might wage wars of devastation merely to gratify the desire of plunder or of power.

And this was a positive advance beyond the moral standard of the times. The purpose of Jehovah looked to the moral training of his people. He might sanction by command an imperfect morality, because the prevailing standard was low, but he could not, without damage, permit anything which the best and most enlightened conscience of the period condemned as wrong.

So far as the effect upon the moral development of Israel is concerned, it was then clearly best, that what in the nature of

things was inevitable, should be done under the sanction of divine command.

We must not forget that wars of extermination, in those far off days, were the rule, not the exception. Israel's history, in this respect, does by no means, fall below the very best conscience of the period. Extermination or slavery was the usual solution of those old-time struggles for existence. It would be a great mistake to suppose that great virtues might not co-exist with these barbaric survivals. The advance of practical morality has ever been one-sided and irregular, as well as slow. Because there were glaring enormities, it does not follow that there were no great excellencies. And that Jehovah finally succeeded in lifting Israel to the very summit of moral grandeur among contemporary peoples, must be taken as a complete vindication of the wisdom and righteousness of his methods.

II. Not many words will be needed to discuss the question of polygamy. In the first place it must be distinctly understood that Moses did not originate polygamous marriages, but found them already in existence and legally recognized as a part of the social economy of all oriental communities. He gave no statute expressly authorizing or prohibiting the practice, but dealt with it as a fixed feature of the imperfectly developed civilizations of those early times.

His policy in regard to it was that of regulation and repression. He enacted provisions in his code which tended certainly to discourage it. This much may be said with perfect safety. It must be constantly borne in mind that Moses, while, in a sense, the founder of a religion, was, at the same time, the law-giver of a nation.

His office was not simply to formulate religious and moral truth and give statutes for ceremonial observances, but to establish a polity adapted to the social and national life of his people. A code of laws for the government of a whole people must necessarily fall below the highest moral ideals. What would be easy of observance by the better classes would be deemed intolerable oppression by the ignorant and morally undisciplined multitude.

The principle holds in human governments to-day.

In which of the States of our national union is the law of marriage framed to accord with the exalted ideal of the Great

Teacher? I answer, not in a single one. Even churches falter in the enforcement of the sublime teaching of the church's head.

It is not to be thought strange, therefore, if a provision is found in the code of the Jewish state which cannot be reconciled with ultimate moral truths. On the contrary, this is just what we should naturally expect. If we take into account the semi-political cast of that dispensation we cannot, indeed, look for any thing else. It would be a terrible reproach upon our modern civilizations to know that the Jewish people three or four thousand years ago had practically realized in their national life the sublime teaching of the gospels concerning the marriage relation, when our most advanced communities are falling so fearfully below this standard.

But the principle upon which Moses legislated concerning polygamy and divorce is clearly stated by our Lord in his own inimitable way. They ask him, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" He answers: "Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife; and the two shall become one flesh."

So they are no more two, but one flesh. They then ask him: "Why did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement and put her away?" He replies: "Moses, for your hardness of heart, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it hath not been so." "Because of the hardness of your hearts Moses suffered you." Here is the principle brought out so as to exclude mistake. Neither simultaneous polygamy nor polygamy in succession, that is, by divorce for other cause than adultery, or its equivalent, is morally right. It can never be right.

But in the code of Israel, because it was the best that the people could bear, God suffered it.

It will be seen that the Lord's reply covers polygamy as well as divorce, though the latter was the question directly brought before him. He says, "God made them male and female;" one man and one woman. The meaning of this is perfectly plain. God meant that a man should have one wife and only one; that a woman should have one husband and no more. "The two," says Jesus,—not the one and the two, or the one and the ten—but the

two shall be one flesh." Thus the divine conception of marriage was symbolized in the act of creation. Polygamy or polyandry was a violation of the eternal fitness of things as expressed in Jehovah's deed.

And yet the principle that tolerated a departure in the Mosaic code is easily understood, and as we have seen, is recognized and acted upon in human governments even in our own day. Not what is theoretically true, but what is the highest practicable truth as a rule of national life, has been the quest of wise legislators in every age of the world. In dealing with Israel Almighty God considered the entire people, gauged with perfect accuracy the range of their moral possibilities, and gave them statutes and institutions, which approximated the standard of absolute truth as nearly as they were able to bear. Nothing better than this was possible. If this course led to the temporary recognition of some things in themselves wrong, the reason is to be sought in human weakness, and not in a legislative mistake.

The principle is simple and satisfactory as a question of human reason, and such is the express comment of Jesus upon the text of the Jewish law-giver. Farther than this nothing need be said. The ground is absolutely clear.

III. The subject of slavery has so long furnished the battleground for politicians and demagogues that it is difficult to approach it without a feeling of hesitation. Can we dismiss utterly the bitterness born of the contests of other days and study the question a little while with sole reference to its bearing upon the divine origin of the Bible? Surely we should be able to do this. No one has now any personal interest either in attacking or defending slavery. Right or wrong, it exists no more among us, and in its political phases it is a matter that does not at all concern us. We should be able to study its moral aspects as coolly and as impartially as we investigate the facts of ancient history or the abstractions of metaphysics.

For myself, I have no desire to conceal from those who may read these pages any view I hold, or have held, on this question, nor have I any inclination, even the slightest, to awaken unpleasant memories, or stir into new life the smouldering embers of old antagonisms. I shall speak freely and take it for granted that I address sensible men and women, capable of facing dispassion-

ately any subject which the interests of truth require them to consider.

To proceed then at once, I freely grant, that in principle, human slavery is essentially and eternally a wrong; that on the basis of ultimate truth it admits no defense which a sound moralist can respect. This is what I sincerely believe, and as an honest man I must examine its biblical aspects with this conviction immovably fixed. If I defend the Bible, I must defend it from my own point of view, as now enunciated. In my judgment the task is difficult; but whether difficult or otherwise, this is the task which every christian teacher encounters, from this day forth, forever. The enlightened conscience of mankind will be satisfied with nothing that stops short of this. When the fathers, in their immortal declaration, said: "We hold it to be self-evident that all men are created equal," I do not care to affirm that they were verbally correct, for I know what may be plausibly urged to the contrary. But when they go on to assert that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," they declare what I believe as firmly as I believe in God and his absolute righteousness. To me this is among the simplest and deepest intuitions of the moral consciousness. If there is any moral truth of which it may be said that it is self-evident, surely this is that truth. Born in a slave state, and never, in the political sense, an abolitionist; reared by parents who owned slaves, yet forgot at no time the demands of gospel equity, or the dictates of generous humanity, I have never, at any time in my life, entertained the least doubt of this great truth. From early boyhood the instinct of universal freedom was with me a profound sentiment, and from it, so far as I now know, my judgment has never wavered.

And yet, I have never been convinced that the ownership of slaves is to the individual owner, in every case, a sin. I do not believe this to-day, any more than I believed it twenty-five years ago. The status of the African in our slave states was fixed by law. Grant, as I certainly do, that the law was a monstrous departure from sound moral truth, the responsibility of the individual was limited to his share, direct or indirect, in the enactment or perpetuation of the law. The single man was powerless to change the law, or the status of persons under the law. His res-

possibility was measured by his power. While the law existed his personal attitude, as regards ownership, affected no man's legal condition. He might own, or not own, and the slave was all the same a slave.

Now it seems clear that in such a state of case, a man might own slaves without being constituted, by the mere fact of ownership, a sinner before God. In such a case, the observance of the equity of the relation is everything. This seems to be clear. And if this position is sound, as I believe it is, the individual owner of slaves who was in no sense responsible for the law, became a sinner only when he failed to discharge the moral obligations which the relation implies. Let it be admitted that such failure was the rule, not the exception; nay, if any one so insists, let it be admitted, for the argument's sake, that the failure was universal. The admission affects not the present question.

It may still be true the sin is in the failure and not in the mere relation. Of course, this position holds only where the institution is established by law, and the individual is powerless to effect a change. Even with this limitation, the distinction is of vast importance in order to a clear and comprehensive understanding of the subject, and it is one that I do not remember to have seen made in former discussions. I make it here because I am sure it is a true distinction, and because of its bearing upon the biblical aspects of the question. But more of this further along.

In treating of Mosaic legislation regarding slavery, there is no need to enter into details. It is sufficient to say that the institution was formally authorized, and that special statutes were enacted for its regulation. That the condition of slaves was better among the Hebrews than among their heathen neighbors goes without saying. The rights of slaves, as slaves indeed, were guarded by special provisions in the national code. But the institution itself remained. This is the one fact with which we are here concerned.

I remark first, that what has been said regarding the origin of polygamy may be said with equal truth concerning the origin of slavery. Moses did not originate it; it was before Moses; it was before Abraham. In the time of the Hebrew lawgiver, it had become a fixed feature in the social economy of nations. Originating

doubtless, in the predatory wars constantly carried on in those early times, it seemed to be the most humane solution of the inevitable problem regarding the disposition to be made of persons captured in battle, or during forays into the enemy's country. The alternative to the half-barbarous Oriental, seemed to be between death and slavery, and it was clearly the better side of his nature which prompted him to prefer the latter. There can be no doubt that it was in this way human slavery began. And the conditions which presided at its birth gave it the sure guarantee of a long existence.

Moses could not hope to raise his people by mere statute quite above the plane of all contemporary life. He must calculate their social and moral level, and legislate for them within the range of practicability. Anything different would have been sheer folly. Only on this principle, I believe, could slavery have found a place in the divine code. Its presence in the polity of Israel, like that of polygamy, was grounded in a condescension to human weakness, and never meant to be taken as the expression of absolute moral truth. It was part of a preliminary and preparatory order of things, in which much imperfection was tolerated because nothing better was at once attainable, and in order that men might be led slowly by the stepping stones of experience up the mount of moral vision. It was a long and toilsome way to be trodden, but there was positively no other. Men must travel this way, or progress was forever barred.

But the moment it is perceived that a divine code, intended for lower stages of development, may give temporary sanction to an imperfect morality, as the best that is possible, the difficulty in regard to the Old Testament aspect of the slavery question vanishes. It is seen to be one of several things, whose solution depends upon the same fundamental principle. It must not be forgotten for a moment that the Hebrew code was intended for the nation, and that the nation contained a large amount of flesh and blood but imperfectly disciplined in questions of morality and of righteousness.

To such an undisciplined multitude clear moral discriminations were, in the very nature of things, impossible. It is utterly inconceivable that they should suddenly disengage themselves from their fixed, traditionary ideas of life. Under proper training they

might grow, but growth is always, relatively, a slow process. Divine condescension in many of the details of the national code became, therefore, an imperative necessity, if the divine purposes were to be accomplished. Hence arose the whole scheme of progressive revelation and the slow and patient lifting up of the national standard of life, which we see pervading everywhere the biblical books. If any one imagines that governments and institutions like our own were possible to ancient peoples, he is cherishing a great mistake. Governments and institutions are largely growths from within, however modified as to mere form by outward conditions.

The best government is always that which is best adapted to the people; that which is both suited to their existing condition, and to the successful development of their highest possibilities. Governments are not, indeed, simply exponents of stages of civilization, but positive factors in the world's progress. Still, the structure of a government must be suited to the genius of the people, and its legal code must be adjusted to the existing phase of their civilization. In earlier and ruder stages of development, the legal perfection characteristic of advanced civilizations is shut out by inexorable conditions.

On this principle God gave to the Israelites institutions and laws, adjusted indeed to their ruder status, but wisely adapted to lead them forward in due time to the highest moral achievements. He gave them, certainly, a morality which was less than perfect, but provided at the same time for the largest ultimate growth. He took them under his special care; he watched over them; he nurtured and disciplined them with more patience and long suffering than ever human father exercised towards a wayward child. Better than this, there was nothing possible.

The New Testament phase of the question, though different, is shaped in a very general sense, by the same principle. The gospel is not a legal code. It looked not to the establishment of a temporal kingdom. But it recognized clearly the great law of moral growth, and made no attempt to accomplish impossibilities. Divine teaching in the scriptures of the New Covenant recognizes existing facts and provides for the accomplishment of the highest ultimate good.

In this, we see the Old Testament idea still operative, but its

scope is very greatly reduced. Jesus and the apostles found slavery still in existence, and strongly entrenched in law and immemorial usage. Say what we will, positive interdiction from the start, would have done far more harm than good. A proposition to revolutionize suddenly the whole social order of the world would have offered the best possible point of attack to enemies always on the alert, without effecting any good to counterbalance the evil. But what needs especial notice here is this. If the mere relation of ownership is not under all circumstances a sin to the individual owner, (and we have seen that in given conditions it is not), there was no absolute moral necessity demanding its immediate interdiction. It is customary to urge that the divine method was to subvert the institution by the operation of great gospel principles, rather than by a direct attack upon its legal standing in the empire. This is doubtless true, but I submit that this is scarcely sufficient, if it is held, at the same time, that the bare relation is in every case a sin. Affirm this, and it seems that there should have been positive interdiction under the New Testament from the very beginning.

The fact that the relation may exist, under certain conditions, without personal sin upon the part of the owner, is then the true key to the New Testament aspect of the question. This perceived, everything else becomes clear. The bare relation, the relation *per se*, is not always a sin. But the *institution* is always a sin. The principle underlying it is a great moral enormity. The relation in every case is liable to dangerous abuses. Hence, while the relation is not absolutely interdicted in the New Testament, it is carefully guarded against every form of abuse. There is a sort of recognition, as far as there is no personal guilt, and instant checks at the limit which must not be passed. Thus hedged in by regulative precepts which must ultimately make it a burden to every enlightened and sensitive conscience, the institution itself was placed in the line of gradual extinguishment by the divine law of moral growth.

But besides the regulative teaching which recognized the relation within certain limits, the founder of Christianity and his apostles placed in juxtaposition with it certain great moral and social ideas which were sure in the end to work out its complete overthrow. Chattel slavery, on its very face, is palpably incon-

gruous with the most fundamental and far-reaching ideas of the New Testament; such, for instance, as the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The notion that human beings might be rightfully bought and sold as you buy and sell horses and cattle, houses and lands, and that the most sacred relations of human life, such as husband and wife, parent and child, might be ruthlessly broken up at the mere will or caprice of another human being, without sin, is one of the strangest delusions that ever gained possession of the human mind.

And the fact that some of the best men that the world has ever had were apparently carried away with this delusion will be looked upon at no distant day as one of the greatest marvels of human history. It is not to be wondered at if the Infinite God, when no other remedy was to be had, suffered this monstrous iniquity to be swept from our fair land, in the midst of one of the mightiest political and social cataclysms recorded in the annals of the world. God is ever present in the history of our race. His footprints are seen in the march of the generations that come and go; in the overthrow of giant wrongs, and in the general betterment of the conditions of human life. It matters not that the cycle of natural causes and sequences is apparently complete without the hypothesis of his presence. This is the fixed method of his ordinary working. But the unseen hand is not a moment withdrawn. "In him we live, and move, and have our being." The steady upward progress of the ages, through the mighty procession of countless generations, carries in it a sublime prophecy of

—"The one far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves,"

and gives effectual guarantee of his constant and gracious superintendence. And if great and overshadowing evils sometimes disappear amid the smoke and roar of bloody battle fields, and the tempestuous throes of social and civil strife, let us never doubt that God is shaping the general course of events, mysterious tho' his way may seem, to accomplish ultimately the highest good for the entire race. Such, at least, is my fixed, unalterable faith, and I would not exchange it for the wealth of worlds. Take this away and nought but chaos and eternal contradictions remain.

IV. And what shall be said of the so-called "imprecatory

Psalms?" When the Psalmist cries out—"Remember, O Lord, the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem; who said: Rase it, rase it even to the foundations thereof. O daughter of Babylon who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be, who rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones"—what are we to think of the feeling so strongly uttered? Or take a specimen from the 109th Psalm ascribed in our English Bible to David: "Set a wicked man over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned, and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few; and let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. * * * * As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him; as he delighteth not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones." What shall be said of the spirit that breathes itself out in these vigorous phrases? Above all things it becometh us, as Christians, to be frank; to be honest with ourselves, and with God. We do not honor the God of the Bible by seeking to cover with sophistical gauze its uncomely parts. What then shall we say? I quote from Smith's Bible Dictionary, the following:

"On the other hand they"—i. e., the Psalms—"imprecate, in the strongest terms, the judgments of God on transgressors. Such imprecations are leveled at transgressors as a body (?), and are uniformly uttered on the hypothesis of their willful persistence in evil, in which case, the overthrow of the sinner becomes a necessary part of the uprooting of sin."

In McClintock and Strong we find this:

"IMPRECATION, an appeal to God, invoking his curse upon (1) one's self, or (2) another. The latter occurs frequently in the so-called "imprecatory Psalms," and is justified partly by the atrocity of the crimes execrated (e. g. that of Doeg) and partly by the fact of special authority in the act of inspiration."

Prof. W. Robertson Smith (O. T. in Jewish church, page 207,) speaks thus:

"Another point in which criticism removes a serious difficulty is the interpretation of the imprecatory Psalms, which can never be explained as having a private reference to David without intro-

ducing an element of personal vindictiveness of a kind greatly calculated to give offense. The injuries done to David by Ahitophel and others, to whom these Psalms are currently supposed to refer, were largely personal. David could not say that he was persecuted as the representative of God's cause in Israel, and without sin on his part. On any interpretation, these Psalms bear more than most others, the impress of the limitations of the Old Covenant; but, at least, the element of personal vindictiveness disappears, when we assign them, as we have every right to do, to later times of persecution, when the fortunes at stake were not those of an individual, but the cause of God's truth against treachery within and persecuting heathenism without."

Of these diverse explanations, the last of which is the best—waving, of course, the critical question of date and authorship on which it depends—it must be frankly said, that none is fairly satisfactory. And, on the current view of inspiration (I mean rather the view that has been current) I submit that a satisfactory explanation is absolutely excluded. The utter incongruity of the spirit of these imprecations with the most explicit teaching of the New Testament is too clear to admit a doubt. But the theory that the Psalmists, whoever they were, wrote with the immediate supernatural guidance of the Holy Spirit has no place for incongruities of any kind. If the Holy Spirit supernaturally dictated every thought, to say nothing of words, there could have been no intrusion of private grievance or personal hatred. There is present in these "imprecations" an unmistakable, pervasive human element, for which the doctrine of plenary inspiration makes no provision. The solution of the problem requires, therefore, the repudiation of this theory. Any admissible explanation of these Psalms, (to say nothing of other inseparable difficulties), which rests on this basis, is an everlasting impossibility. And the sooner we cut loose from false notions about the Bible, the sooner shall we be able to defend it successfully—in the court of our own consciences, and in the judgment of fair-minded men—against the specious, but unreal cavils of unbelief. Supernatural inspiration is a fact. Revelation is a fact. But the immediate dictation of the promiscuous contents, all and singular, of the biblical Books by the Spirit of God is not a fact, and the sooner we confess it, and adjust ourselves to the reality, the better will it be both for us as Christians, and for

the outside world. There is nothing to gain, and everything to lose, if we attempt to defend even truth from a false point of view.

But why should we maintain the supernatural dictation of every thought and feeling in the Jewish Psalter? It is clear that "the impress of Old Covenant limitations" is upon it. "You have heard that it was said by them of old time: Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that you may be the sons of your Father in Heaven." This is the teaching of Jesus. But a human impulse at open war with this teaching is found in the Psalms in question. Our conception of its Inspiration in relation to the biblical contents must make room for this unquestionable fact. When this has been done the difficulty raised by unbelief vanishes forever. It will help us perhaps, if we consider the nature of these songs of Israel. (1) They are metrical compositions. Is it to be held that the Holy Spirit guided the writers as to the form of composition? Is it not far more probable that the choice of poetical form sprang out of their own temperament, and was determined, partly, at least, by the object which they had before them? (2). These compositions were intended, as a rule at least, to be sung in worship. They are "Spiritual songs," giving expressions to the most vivid experiences of those who wrote them, in the multiform phases and moods of their religious life. They present us by far the best picture we possess of the inner life of pious Israelites under the Old Covenant, rising oftentimes to the loftiest range of Old Testament Spirituality, but in no case, transcending it. The "impress of its limitations" is everywhere felt. They are not all pitched at the same elevation, either poetical or ethical. They exhibit conspicuous inequalities in both these respects. (3). May they not fitly be compared with the Spiritual songs written by the great singers of the Christian church? If not, I ask, why not? Of course, when the Holy Spirit was immediately present in prophetic, or other supernatural endowment, we may concede a difference, but is it not bare assumption to maintain that this was *always* the case? Especially is not this true when we consider the leading purpose of such compositions? In any event, as has been already said, we are compelled to make room for the human element, about whose presence there can be no mistake, and when this has been fairly and honestly done, the attacks

of unbelief need be no longer feared. When the theory of immediate dictation is given up, all difficulty vanishes. In this conclusion there may be perfect confidence.

Finally, the one thing to be kept ever in mind throughout discussions like the present is this: The Bible is not only a progressive revelation, but is itself a record of the ages of that progress. It gives us the great steps of the forward movement in historical outline, not in systematic form. Of a revelation so given at first, and so reported to future ages, the only possible test, as Dr. Mozley has most happily shown, (*Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, Lecture tenth, *Passim*) is its final outcome. By this the Bible may be fairly judged. By this its friends are most anxious to have it judged. The ethical ideas of the gospel invite criticism, and defy attack. But the gospel is not a mere skeleton of moral ideas, however perfect. It is a "Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus." It not only tells men how to live, but it imparts life, that they may live. There is not a believer on earth whose faith is not consciously in him a moral and spiritual force, tending to ennoble and exalt his whole life. And towards this inspiring faith, towards this lofty plane of actual life, God has been leading men through all the aeons of history. The *end* is the test of the wisdom of his methods. Blessed be his name, forever!

G. W. LONGAN.

OUR POWER, AND OUR DANGER OF SUPPRESSING IT.

The ability to present, to illustrate and to enforce God's truth is the power under consideration. This partial definition sufficiently distinguishes this power from the Gospel which is God's power; the latter being the truth to be presented, the former the ability to present it.

Nor is this ability to be confounded with the known power of philosophers, ancient and modern, to discover by process of reason, or by experiment, and then to present their discovery as truth. It is rather the reception of truth from God without the philosophy, and even despite the philosophy and then the presentation, illustration and enforcement of that, *truth from God, not from men.*

Originally this power was directly from God through our risen and glorified Redeemer; now it comes through the word of God. Formerly it showed itself miraculously; *now* as it really exists without the miracles.

On this power the Apostle Paul, for instance, implicitly relied, not on his own wisdom or natural strength, however much he may have possessed. His heroic boldness and firmness against the Jew, though himself a Jew; his confidence and courage against the Greek, sprang from the conscious possession of a power which his opposers did not have. Though to some his bodily presence might be weak, and his speech contemptible, yet "strong in the Lord," he cared not. Undaunted he stood against all the wisdom of the learned and fiercest fires of persecution, shouting, "Greater is he that is for us than all they that be against us." "The weapons of our warfare are * * * * mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

While Paul thus triumphantly asserts the power within him, and knows it is from God, yet it is so far his own, that he, with the necessity laid upon him to preach, struggles, and prays, and weeps,

seemingly conscious, all the while, that he might abuse that power.

I would call this power *inspiration* but for the confusion on that subject, resulting from conflicting theories as to what inspiration really was. Besides it may have been more than could be meant by the term inspiration. The fact that the power existed is enough, call it what you will.

But does the same power exist now? To the Christian this is tantamount to asking, is the Spirit of God now among men? What is meant may be more clearly seen by regarding the following as *identical equations* :

POWER IN THE DAYS OF APOSTLES.

POWER IN OUR DAY.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The Holy Spirit speaking God's will, equals | 1. The Holy Spirit having spoken God's will. |
| 2. The Holy Spirit as Comforter equals | 2. The Holy Spirit as Comforter. |
| 3. Word spoken and confirmed by miracle equals | 3. Word, having been confirmed by miracle. |
| 4. Faith equals | 4. Faith. |

Be it remembered that the Holy Spirit is a *Person*, not an *influence*, and what he *has spoken* is what he *now speaks*. "He shall glorify me," said Jesus, "for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." John 16:14. God and Jesus and the Holy Spirit teach the same thing.

To show the existence of the power we are considering, and our danger of suppressing it, we must trace out as clearly as possible the *marked diversity*, yet *essential unity* between the work of the Spirit in the days of the Apostles, and the work of the same Spirit in our own day. In doing this the following divisions of our subject are demanded :

I. THE PERPETUAL POWER IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

II. THE SUPPRESSION OF OUR POWER, OR QUENCHING THE SPIRIT, IS THE STANDING DANGER OF THE CHURCH.

The fact stands prominent in the world's history that, on the first Pentecost after our Lord's crucifixion—the true birth-day of the Church—the Spirit was poured out from Heaven. This was in fulfillment of our Lord's promise : "You shall receive *power* after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you," This same Spirit of God hovered over the waters of the early chaos and filled their depths with life, gave to Samson his gigantic strength, to Bezaleel, the great artist, his genius and skill, to David, his poetic fancy,

and to Elijah his prophetic fire. "Holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." Yet *the promise* to the Apostles (as we shall see) was unparalleled before; made dependent on the Saviour's departure, and worth the loss of his visible presence to obtain. He was, however, the same Spirit, but through Apostles he revealed what was hidden from the ages gone before, and by them, did more than by the seers of old. Moreover this coming of the Spirit is what the Saviour meant when he said: "I will not leave you comfortless. I will come to you." "Behold I am with you always, even to the end of the world." "In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." Henceforth one and the same truth is asserted in these three ways: (1). "God dwells in you." (2). "Christ in you the hope of Glory," and (3). "His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Ineffable blessing! No wonder the Apostle claimed the pentecostal bowing of the Heavens as the great fulfillment of prophecy—the culminating glory—the true sign of "the last days"! Here we have the Spirit of God come down to men, or if you please, "God bowed the heavens and came down," or Jesus returned, not as an occasional visitant, but as an abiding guest; for, says Peter, "the *promise* is to you and to your children, and to them that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call" (by the gospel). 2. Thes. 2:14. Acts 2:39. *What promise?* Certainly what Peter had just made, viz: Remission of sins and gift of the Holy Spirit, conditioned upon their repentance and baptism.

From the very beginning, then, we have the miraculous utterance (they spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance) and the reception of the Holy Spirit on the part of those who gladly received the word, blended; and later an Apostle argued the *oneness* of the Spirit, notwithstanding "the diversities of operations"—"dividing to every man severally as he will"—showing that differences in manifestations do not prove difference, or plurality, in the power that manifests itself.

While theologians have been inventing, and debating about, and dividing over "*theories* of Spiritual influence" (why not say sometimes God's influence or Christ's influence?) a subject not treated at all in the Bible, the fact that the Spirit has spoken has been held too loosely. The mind being fixed upon a supposed influence apart from His word, has led to a skepticism as to the

reality of his work. The theories are not necessary, but the *fact* is all important that the Holy Spirit has spoken, and *is* speaking—the Bible being his word. Not only so, but the Church is the “temple of the Holy Spirit,” and it must be true forever that “if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.” Rom. 8:9.

Looking back upon the early church, and judging of the *power* by the work that was done, it must be conceded that there was, to say the least, *a special endowment of many of the first heralds, or preachers of the truth.* There are, in our day, few questions of more importance than this. On every hand a foggy something, called inspiration, is being assailed, and almost every assailant has been fighting a theory rather than the thing itself. There are those who would degrade the Apostles and Prophets by the polite admission that they had a power uncommon which gave them a place not far removed from Socrates, Shakespeare or Milton. Now I grant the difficulty of laying down a theory of what men call inspiration, and the impossibility, thus far, of stating a theory free from serious objections. If the truth were recognized, possibly there could be no theory about it, but just *one* all comprehensive and inexplicable *fact*, namely: THE HOLY SPIRIT SPOKE. At any rate men have written and spoken and devised theories on the subject as though *a theory was necessary to the admission of a fact*, and as though an *imperfect theory* must forever *hinder the clear perception of a fact.* While the few wise ones have been settling the theory of light, and respectable thinkers have been doubting and opposing their theories, the light itself has been brightly shining, and none but the *blind* have been unable to rejoice in it.

We may never be able to draw the exact line so as to certainly define the endowment. The Bible itself says little about the nature of the power. No apostle went about saying to the people, “I am inspired;” nor were the people in doubt on the subject. The fact was recognized—the power was there, perhaps as unsearchable and inexplicable as is God himself. And in view of this fact it would seem to be as unreasonable to deny the shining of the sun as to dispute the perfect and complete revelation of the will of God by those who were chosen to do that very thing. Nothing but the power to do this could have transformed ignor-

ant, self-confident, weak Peter and despairing John into marvelous heroes, and unfaltering preachers of the Gospel, making the unlearned, ignorant fishermen the embodiments of wisdom; and doing this in such a way as to let the people perceive that of themselves they were unlearned and ignorant men, yet saying and doing what the people marveled at, and could say nothing against, or explain in any way but by admitting that they had been with Jesus. (Acts 4:13).

It may be objected that all this could be admitted without touching the question of inspiration. Not so. It touches the question in every way, and comprehends it fully. It holds on to the existence of a power, and accepts all the facts set forth by that power without attempting to explain them by any theory. It claims that the Holy Spirit *gave utterance*, and gave us, therefore, *God's word*. If any part were given without the power herein argued, *that part is not God's word*.

To maintain the individuality of the various writers and speakers, and at the same time to have through them *God's word* and not simply *their own word*, is a supposed difficulty urged against what is called "The Plenary Theory of Inspiration." But it seems to me to be against the *power itself* and assumes that the Holy Spirit could not do this, whereas the ability to reveal truth at all, namely—a *divine power*—is ability to *preserve* the marked peculiarities of the writers. It is only necessary to hold fast the fact that the first *teachers gave us God's Word*. The book from their hands comes with demonstration of the Spirit. The truths from their lips and pens are not "strung together for the daws of criticism to peck at, but are words of life, to be received as the choicest gifts of God; for like their master they spoke with authority."

Moreover, there were, in the apostolic era, special exhibitions of this same power in what are called "gifts of the Spirit," (*χρίσματα τοῦ πνεύματος*), in the unusual ability to teach and rule, in the capacity to prophesy, to heal the sick, and even to raise the dead. Effects like these bore direct evidence of superhuman power. It was a grand epoch. It met a great need and produced stupendous results.

As was foretold these gifts declined and finally passed away. The exact date of their departure cannot be fixed, nor are we

to suppose that they all left together, but go they did, for they are not possessed now. What is known as the Roman Catholic church lays claim, to be sure, to the possession of miraculous power, but her pretended infallibility is too absurdly variable and has too often contradicted itself for her assertions to be worthy of regard. Besides, her pretended miracles are too far-fetched and too extravagant to bear a moment's comparison with those of earlier days.

But why did these gifts cease as certainly they did? Was it because the Spirit himself was withdrawn? This could be claimed only on the ground that nothing but a miracle could attest the presence of the Spirit, which is false. Was it because the piety and faith of the church declined? Some think so and believe that with sufficient faith and piety these gifts could be regained. But if the possession of these miraculous gifts depended on the purity of the church, it is passing strange that the most corrupt of the early churches possessed the most striking gifts; whereas the gifts declined as the piety grew under the fires of persecution, and it was only in the darker ages that the claim was ever renewed.

These gifts had really done all their work. They had served their purpose, and were hence withdrawn. But is the absence of miraculous gifts a loss of power? To some it may so seem. There are, and have ever been, men who can see no force except in a storm, and who always look for God in the earthquake, or the cyclone. And many, doubtless, are ready to affirm that the first christians with power to reveal God's will and their gifts of prophecy and tongues must have been better off than we are now, and cry out almost in despair, "Oh, for some inspiration to settle our differences, and some miraculous power to compel the indifferent to listen to our word!"

Has the church, then, suffered any loss? Was the church originally better off than it is now? Had it then anything of which we are deprived? Unquestionably no! The church has gained, not lost, and all it ever had it possesses still.

The power to bring out new truth has gone. But it has gone simply because we have all the truth. The revelation itself is here. When the world was all in darkness God made the sun, moon and stars to give light; and who could think that it is any loss to us if he does not go on creating still. They are there for

all time and all we need are good eyes and improved telescopes with which to see them. And inasmuch as in the Bible, which God has made for us, we have the full light of divine truth and in the Christ of the Bible, the light of the world, with the Bible in our hands and the Spirit of God in our hearts, we have all that inspiration itself ever did, or could do, for the church of old. And though some may have then climbed to heights we have not reached and scanned a clear horizon far broader than our own, the church was never in a position half so favorable for obtaining a full-orbed view of the entire revelation, and never had a better opportunity for entering into the possession of all the truth.

Eighteen centuries of salvation and mighty triumphs of truth are, to those who have eyes to see, as great an argument for christianity as all the miracles of the apostolic age. It remains only to state the conclusions under this head :

1. The power in the church to-day is the same as that in the church of old : because God and Jesus and the Holy Spirit *are the same* forever, and human nature is the same, and faith is the same.

2. Our use of that power ought to be even more effective.

3. While originally the Spirit spoke and confirmed the word with signs and miracles, we now have precisely what the Spirit spoke, namely, the Word of God, already confirmed.

4. The same Spirit, as an abiding guest, that dwelt in the church at Corinth is dwelling in the church still, not to speak with tongues and work miracles, to be sure, but to do greater things than these. Still is he here to lead the children of God to their Father's house.

II. THE SUPPRESSION OF OUR POWER, OR QUENCHING THE SPIRIT, IS THE STANDING DANGER OF THE CHURCH.

Our power is determined by the fact that we have the *Word of God* and are *possessors* of the *Spirit of God*. This implies such holy living as to keep the Word and not to grieve the Spirit, and thereby drive him from us. Then, to ignore, or to fail to receive and teach the Word of God, or to live unrighteously, is to *suppress our power*.

With no attempt to explain the *how* of the in-dwelling Spirit, the Christian accepts the fact upon divine testimony, as also the fact that "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwells in him and he in God." Furthermore he has "Christ

in him the hope of glory." Explanation here is impossible. But sundry Scriptures, familiar to the Bible student, positively assert that the self-same Spirit which wrought through apostles and prophets in the early days, giving the Word of God and confirming it by demonstration indisputable, dwells in the child of God, strengthening his infirmities and interceding for him.

It follows from what has been said that the danger of suppressing God-given power has not always been the same, but has varied from age to age. The nature of the danger changes; the danger itself remains. We cannot quench the Spirit as those who were miraculously endowed could have done, (as is implied in Paul warning them not to do so), and they were not exposed to the dangers which beset us.

In the case of the first teachers and preachers there may have been temptation to suppress the truth in face of danger, or from the power of prejudice, or even to pervert the gospel for the sake of reward. Had they yielded—had Peter dismissed the messengers from Cornelius and refused to receive the lesson taught him in the vision; had Paul preached circumcision as an element of the gospel to be observed in the name of Christ, because of Jewish prejudice, instead of the liberty wherewith Christ has made both Jew and Gentile free; had the apostles, through fear of any consequences, allowed a perversion of the gospel by Judaizing teachers—with most disastrous results they would have quenched the Spirit. To us the Judaizing tendencies do not present themselves in the same form, but let no one conclude therefrom that these tendencies do not exist even now. The question of circumcision can never again be obtruded as a disturbing element, and we are in no danger of being cramped by the rules of the old synagogue service; yet, how often do good men and women, even in the clearer light of the better testament, look back into the darkness, and with a slavish spirit demand a "*thou shalt not*" of the law, or, as it is more mildly stated, demand "*some contravention of divine law,*" before they will admit the sin of introducing what the Lord Jesus has not authorized. And this slavish cry for prohibition claims the hallowed name of LIBERTY.

We have no miraculous powers to suppress, no speaking with tongues to put down. We cannot in this way quench the Spirit; yet if from official jealousy, or from a supercilious regard for re-

finement and elegance in speech, the brethren are not permitted, nor encouraged, to participate in the worship, we do in effect just what Paul exhorted the brethren not to do (1 Thess. 5:19)—we stifle the energies, destroy the enthusiasm, and suppress the power of the church. The same danger exists now as of old and we do actually suppress our power:

I. If we wilfully hide or suppress the truth. We can readily see that the early teachers and preachers would have extinguished the light and suppressed the power within them, had they, while knowing the whole truth, kept back half.

The same must be true of all others. What men call inspiration on the part of apostles, could make no difference between them and us in this regard. Whether you light half instead of all the lamps in a room, or lock up half when others have lighted all, the effect would be just the same. So the result would be the same whether an apostle refused to speak the truth, or you kept it back when spoken. This last has been done repeatedly. For a long time the Church of Rome deliberately kept the Word of God locked up in a language that few could read, while teaching for doctrine the commandments of men. And even now, when the Word of God is no longer locked up in a dead language, and we can in our own tongue read for ourselves there are many ways in which the truth is hidden—the Spirit is quenched. How many there are who, having Bibles, might just as well have "Patent Office Reports," but for the supposed respectability and mark of civilization in having a Bible! For they never read the Bible with honest purpose of heart to find out what really is the mind of the Spirit, or the meaning of the words.

Again, there are those who are so bound down by old creeds, fettered by authoritative articles, or hampered by a fear of some imaginary heresy, that they make their own Bibles as they go along. They may pray for the Spirit and altogether honestly hope to be led by the Spirit into the truth, yet full of the superstition that the Spirit will teach them in some way other than by what he has spoken, they proceed to bind the Spirit down by conditions of their own making. And even when they read the word they keep distinctly in view what they wish the Spirit to teach them. The earnest prayer of one man is that he may be led into all the truth provided it does not contradict the "Thirty-Nine

Articles," or the "Athanasian Creed;" the Calvinist is open to conviction on every point if only he be kept clear of Arminianism; and the Arminian will follow the Spirit wherever he may lead unless it should be into Calvinism. The Baptist admits his need of further light on every subject except baptism, and some imagine that death and destruction will surely come to those who learn more than Alexander Campbell knew.

In short, all man-made "Creeds" and "Articles of Faith" do but quench the Spirit. They all mean that the children must think as their fathers thought, that we shall grow so tall and no taller; that the Spirit of God shall open no road to carry us off the rails on which our fathers were content to ride; shall let in no light which they did not have; shall keep rigid sects rigidly apart, fetter their freedom, strengthen their prejudices, contract their horizon and so quench the Spirit.

2. Our power is not such as could enlarge the Bible or add to its truths; nor is there any power that could do this. Because the Bible contains the whole truth on the subjects of which it treats. We no more expect a new edition of Christianity revised and enlarged than we expect new metals to be poured into our mines. But as men of science have been exploring the earth for centuries and are continually bringing up something new to us though it must have laid where they found it for myriads of years; so he who will honestly and earnestly dig into this Book, as for hidden treasure, will find that we have not yet discovered all the truth, and will learn that God has more light in his word and works than the world has yet seen. But if we read with an assumption that we already know all that is worth knowing, and have a sectarian determination that the Spirit shall teach us nothing more on any subject; or if, to avoid unwelcome conclusions and to save our theology, we explain and explain away and read between the lines; or break off every thread that would lead us where we do not wish to go, we make the Spirit's guidance of no worth at all, and positively suppress our power to know the truth.

3. IF, HAVING RIGHT CONVICTIONS, WE STIFLE OR SUPPRESS THEM, WE QUENCH THE SPIRIT AND ACTUALLY DESTROY OURSELVES.

The Spirit does not come to us now to speak to us new truth as he once spoke to Peter, telling him to go to Cornelius nothing

doubting, or to Paul to forbid his going into Bithynia, and to direct his steps to Troas. Still what the Spirit has spoken is what he now speaks and the Bible is his utterance, by which he produces convictions of duty unquestionably right and unmistakably clear. If, then, for the sake of gain, or for pleasure or ease, we heed not what the Spirit says, force our conscience away from truth, turn our feet from the goal, stop our ears, and shut our eyes to duty, and refuse to do what we know is right, in vain will be our prayers; and our long drawn solemnity will be but a solemn mockery. Or if, on the other hand, losing sight of our high calling, we run the race for wealth or honor, as others run, and let the world rather than the Spirit direct our course, or "ranting round in pleasure's ring," if we, with serious misgivings, grave doubts, do what our conscience condemn, stretch forth the hand and touch what is forbidden, our light grows dim, and happy for us if it does not end in utter darkness.

4. BY UNDULY RESTRICTING THE USEFULNESS OF OTHERS WE QUENCH THE SPIRIT—WE SUPPRESS OUR POWER.

After reading 1 Cor. 12, and other Scriptures which tell the Spirit's special work, by special gifts, in the early days, it is common to pass on, amazed, and staggered in faith perhaps, until we find some plain commandment on which we can stand and from which we can look back and say, "Those were days of miracles, and miracles have passed away." To be sure, miracles have passed away, but have they gone and taken all their effects, all the lessons they taught, with them? If so, why were these Scriptures left behind? Do they teach us nothing; or are they left simply to tantalize us? No! they are meant to have the same power now that they ever had. They teach at least one very important truth. Whether the special gift was a power *ab extra*, or the strengthening, refining and exalting of a power already possessed, the meaning was that he who had a special power was to use that special power and it determined the special ministry of its possessor. "There were diversities of gifts but the same Spirit," and "the manifestation of the Spirit was given to every man to profit withal." And whoever would restrain or pervert the gift would quench the Spirit.

The same lesson, or law, holds good now as then, and it is only necessary to remember the parable of the talents to see its

meaning. Aside from the miracles, for they are gone, the lesson was, and is, that of responsibility according to ability. There are few truths that need more emphasis just now than that every Christian has received a divine call (and this by virtue of his being a Christian), is endowed with the divine spirit and is in possession of some divine *χρίσμα*, or spiritual gift. This is but another name for one of the clearest and dearest principles prominent in the church of the early days, namely, *the universal ministry of believers in Christ*. Does this imply that the church has no need of pastors and preachers, in the proper sense of those words? By no means. The existence of these at the first and now, but confirms the principle, that each is to perform the duty for which his gift qualifies him. We cannot overrate the importance of good government and good teaching, and therefore of good pastors and good teachers. The two are not incompatible. We are none of us ministers apart from the church, but simply a part of the ministering church. There is in truth no such distinction as is commonly made between God's "λαός" or "laity," and his "κλήρος" or "clergy." But in the light of such a truth priestcraft could not live; hence priests, both Papal and Protestant, and all clerical gentlemen who ape them, have ever tried to suppress this God-given power of the church. So adroitly and so successfully was this done in olden times, even to the obtaining possession of both body and soul, that not to think as Councils thought, or as Parliaments thought, was to be accursed forever. No! the ministry of every child of God is on precisely the same level as that of the preachers, and all Christians are priests. Since then the ministry of visiting the sick, of teaching the young, of giving and of getting too, are as divine as that of pastor and preacher, the actual doing of these things in a systematic, definite manner, and the necessity of doing them, ought to obtain in every church as certainly as the work of pastors and preachers. I believe in no special call to ministry in the church, because I believe in the call of every Christian and the gift of the Spirit to them all. Each one's ability determines his ministry. God has not endowed us all alike, but he has endowed us all. And whether your peculiar talent lay in the head or in the hand, fitting you for the desk or the plow or the pulpit, for teaching or for trade, that gift determines your ministry in the church of God. Suppress that talent,

pervert it or waste your time, and you suppress your power.

The true conception of the church presents the noble spectacle of men of business trading for Christ and getting, to have the more to give, students of all kinds studying for Christ; and men of science bringing their researches to bear more directly on his cause; while all, both rich and poor, unite with gifts of endless variety to spread his kingdom in the world. Whatever hinders this, whether it comes from a superstitious notion as to the far-off, unearthly nature of the ministry of the gospel, or from the still more superstitious notion that ordinary pursuits are too secular to form a part of the Savior's work, or from priestly jealousy on the part of those in office, or from dread of study and research on the part of any one, is to that extent quenching the Spirit.

5. So intimately blended with the sanctified spirit of man is the Spirit of God, that sometimes it is difficult to tell which is meant, the human or the divine. When this is so, it matters not which, either or both, e. g., "The flesh wars against the spirit." This is true alike of the Spirit of God and the human spirit, and of both, and more emphatically true when man's spirit is one with the divine. It follows, therefore, *that to hinder or destroy the usefulness of any servant of God is to quench the divine spirit.* O, how many wrecks, along here, of lives that might have been useful if the life had not been crushed out by those whose duty it was to have given timely aid and sympathy. The preacher ascends week by week the sacred rostrum before those who know him not, to whose struggles and anxieties they are strangers. They have no prayer for him, except the wish that he may *please them*. But in order to this he must run the gauntlet of adverse criticism, happy if he can endure the venomous words of spite, insult, injury, and scorn, that gall and pierce his heart. They bind him hand and foot; they lash him with the tongue; they load him down with responsibility not his own; they starve him in purse and soul and then say to him, "*be fluent and uncious, be eloquent, be seraphic, and show us heaven.*" But alas! fettered thus, he has no heaven to show. The hope of finally seeing heaven himself almost dies out in his wounded, bleeding heart. Grown old thus, he is turned out, and stumbles into the grave; while those for whom he labored perhaps never think of the sin of quenching the Spirit.

Is this picture too sad? Then let us remember that while the church may kill the preacher, the preacher may kill the church. Petted and praised, with a fleshly mind puffed up, his ministrations are with faultless logic and rhetorical skill. The dry bones of his philosophy rattle wonderfully.

Refined in learning—"poor religion's pride,
In all the pomp of method and of art
His *words* display to congregations wide
Devotion's every grace, except the heart."

While the propriety is amazing, the formality is crushing. The prayers are cold, partake of a general nature, encompass the Jews and end on self. The poor are uncared for, the cry of the heathen, even at the very door, is unheeded, and missions fail. The tear of penitence seldom starts, and there is little sympathy with the suffering Redeemer; for while he says: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness"—the heart replies, "seek first wealth, honor and worldly position;" and all this because the preacher from his icy pinnacle has "snowed on the church."

Says Cowper,

"Would I describe a preacher, such as Paul,
Were he on earth would hear, approve, and own,
Paul should himself direct me.
I would express him simple, grave, sincere;
In doctrine uncorrupt: in language plain,
And plain in manner; decent, solemn, chaste,
And natural in gesture: much impressed
Himself, as conscious of his awful charge,
And anxious mainly that the flock he feeds
May feel it too; affectionate in look,
And tender in address, as well becomes
A messenger of grace to guilty men.
Behold the picture! Is it like? Like whom?
The things that mount the rostrum with a skip,
And then skip down again, repeating what they never wrote,
Just fifteen minutes, huddle up their work
And with a well-rounded grace close the scene!
In man or woman, but far most in man,
And most of all in man that ministers
And serves the altar, in my soul I loathe
All affectation.
What! will a man play tricks in the presence of his God?
Or will he seek to dazzle me with tropes,
As with the diamond on his lily hand,
And play his brilliant parts before my eyes
When I am hungry for the bread of life?"

- Such was not Paul. Lest the light that is in us prove to be darkness, lest we quench the Spirit utterly and destroy the hope

within us, with trembling reverence let us look over the faults of preachers, and our own faults, if we can, and away to Jesus our Savior, from our sins and our life.

6. Of all the dangers that beset the Church in this respect is that of extinguishing light, or quenching the Spirit, by *official assumption*. It took some time to persuade the Church at Jerusalem that it was a right thing for a Church to grow up at Antioch in such an irregular way. Had not the Spirit of God been stronger than men, Luther and the other reformers would never have given the Bible to the world; Carey would not have carried the Word to the heathen; and Wesley would not have preached a simple warm-hearted devotion through the length and breadth of England. The established Church of England tried hard for a long time to compel the Spirit of God to adopt its shibboleth, and to convey all the water of life through the pipes that it had laid down. It would have silenced a Bunyan rather than admit that a Separatist of any kind could convey the light of life to the world. In our own land sectarianism did actually stigmatize as heretics Alexander and Thomas Campbell, Barton Stone, Walter Scott, and a host of God's noble men because, for sooth, they refused to speak where the Spirit had not spoken, and claimed that what the Spirit has spoken is all sufficient for the union in Christ of all God's children, because they plead (as do we), for the unqualified restoration of the religion of Christ; "*the Bible alone; its faith in its purity; its practice without change.*" In the words of Alexander Campbell: "*Let the BIBLE be substituted for all human CREEDS; FACTS for definitions; THINGS for words; FAITH for speculation; UNITY OF FAITH, for unity of opinion; THE POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD for human legislation and tradition; PIETY for ceremony; MORALITY for partizan zeal; THE PRACTICE OF RELIGION for the mere profession of it; and the work is done.*" These words are worthy to be printed in majestic capitals on the title page of every man's Bible. Strange to think of and to look back upon the booted and spurred knights of opinionism rallied to the defence of trembling sectarianism against these children of light, with a result that made them hide behind, and build higher their sectarian walls, and content themselves by quenching the spirit, each in his own way. To-day, the long unbroken silence on questions that should stir men's souls to their very depths, and the

positive refusal of partizans to obtain even a clear conception of our aim, but betokens a determination on the part of denominations to go on quenching the spirit. There are, nevertheless, grand men and women in the sectarian ranks whose eyes are opening to the truth of our plea, and they are loosing hold on human creeds, and are even adopting the very truths for which the Campbells, Scott, Smith, Milligan, et al. contended a half century ago, and for which we now contend. Still, while these men are shining through their works as stars in the firmament, and almost a million of disciples everywhere are vowing that the Spirit of God shall be free, cold is the encouragement that many give them and timid the recognition they receive.

But why speak of others? Is it not the fact that there is a power for good locked up in many of our own churches, which ought to be called forth, and by the suppression of which, whether by official jealousy, or by selfish indolence on the part of those who ought to work, the spirit is quenched, or extinguished? Pastors and preachers have not the right knack of fulfilling one of the most important duties of their office, viz: "The perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry." They do far too much themselves, just because it is easier to do a thing yourself than to set others to do it. But the *busy pastor or preacher is not always the best*. As the most successful general would not be one who ran about in the vain attempt to fire off every gun and defend every post himself, but one who could put the right man in the right place, fill other hearts with enthusiasm and courage, and direct them with the requisite wisdom and skill; so the successful pastor is not one who tries, beyond all human strength, to do all the visiting, all the preaching, all the thinking, all the working for the people, but one who can discover latent talent, and set it to work; stimulate sluggish minds and set them to thinking; find out the unoccupied and give them something to do, and by a genial influence upon such as are able to give, succeed in making them cheerful givers. In a church so trained the Spirit will work with freedom and energy; in others he will be cramped and confined. To effect the longedfor revolution in our churches there must be the practical recognition of the fact that what is needed, in the way of teaching, is not men who can simply make pleasing, eloquent speeches, but who can preach the gospel, and who actually *preach the gospel*,

and not some *speculations about* the gospel; who themselves are saved by it, and who rely upon the *gospel* as God's power unto salvation to all them that believe.

O. A. CARR.

THE PERMANENT MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH.

In all great revolutions of public sentiment, whether political, scientific, moral or religious, it is quite necessary that the chief actors at least have clear and settled views on all the leading subjects that may call for discussion, or that may be necessary to eliminate for the accomplishment of the work in hand. Confusion of thought, or vacillation in purpose, will always weaken the force of what any one has to present, cripple his influence and more or less prejudice his cause. Even when a cause has been fairly started and well defined in its objects and aims, there will often arise among its advocates, some who have not comprehended the full scope of the movement, or from some other cause have failed to grasp the whole truth in the case. Differences may arise that may retard the work, lead to great confusion and even a failure, unless a constant, watchful eye, and a truth-loving spirit, seeing these defects, shall give warning of the danger, and often direct attention anew to the truth upon the subject and the end had in view.

In a great religious revolution like that inaugurated early in the present century, by Stone, the Campbells, *et al.* engaged in the work, we could not expect that everything could be settled and fully acquiesced in at once, or even in a single generation. The effort contemplated nothing less than a full return to the apostolic christianity of the New Testament in spirit and practice—a full restoration to the religious world of the religion founded and established by Jesus the Christ and his holy Apostles. To effect such an undertaking as this, after the obscurity of the dark ages of Roman triumph for more than a millennium of years, when all

nations had been made drunk with the wine of her fornication, so that even the Protestant world, which had protested against some of her sins, were unable to stand erect upon a scriptural basis alone, was by far the grandest effort of the ages made by uninspired men. Ezra, Nehemiah and Zerubbabel, after a long captivity in literal Babylon, undertook the restoration to the Jews of their law and relation, this and seems the nearest event in history to that of the present century. Yet theirs was an effort for a single nation, aided by the then most powerful earthly prince; but this is for all nations, kingdoms and peoples of this and the succeeding ages of earth's inhabitants, aided and guided alone by truth and the author of all truth.

In this effort everything has to be tested by the New Testament; and there are two things that often stand in the way of a speedy settlement of some important matters for the general good and the rapid triumph of the plea. First, so rapid has been the increase of adherents to this plea, that coming in from all other religious parties, and from those of no religious party, each having his peculiar religious bias from previous religious training, it has been impossible at once to unite and cement together so many discordant elements without some friction, some misunderstandings and heart-burnings. And second, so terrible has been the religious tyranny of Rome and some other religious parties, that in turning from these and seeking for greater religious liberty; and withal educated and trained in political freedom, some have, like the pendulum of the clock, swung to the opposite extreme—to a lawless liberty, not in harmony with good order and the sacred scriptures. The church of Christ is not a lawless democracy, allowing every member to act as he may please, irrespective of the wishes and interests of his brethren and the general good of the whole brotherhood; nor is each congregation, though well organized with all the divinely prescribed officers, and laboring together in union and harmony at home, independent in all things of its sister congregations. The whole body, under Christ the living head, is so "joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part as maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. 4:16.)

To remedy any and all of these evils, and bring order out of

confusion, where it may exist, and cause each one to stand and work for the Master in his own proper place, where he can do most for the good of the race, in harmony with all the other members, is a work of time, patience and prayerful labor for the real lovers of the Savior. While in many of the churches, and even in large districts of country, the most of the congregations may have reached a good degree of perfection in matters of church discipline and coöperative work, yet there are other congregations and districts where good order, unity and coöperation in all good works, are almost strangers, and call loudly for a more complete return to the apostolic teaching, order and practice of the primitive church.

We must not conclude that because we are free men in Christ Jesus, that therefore we are absolutely free; or that we are allowed to use our freedom for an occasion to the flesh to fulfill its lusts—to subserve any merely selfish or personal ends. Very far from it. We, as Christians, are free men *in Christ Jesus*. Within the periphery, marked out by Christ for his followers, we are free, but not beyond this. All true freedom is restraint, for our good or the good of others. Christian freedom is within the restraints that Christ imposes. Beyond this is lawlessness—is sin.

Christ has been pleased for the good order of his people, and for the good of the world, to establish over them a government of which he himself is the head—the absolute autocrat. His will is the supreme law. His government is therefore a Christocracy. But since he has returned to Heaven and been crowned Lord of all, it became him “by whom all things were created that are in heaven and that are upon earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers” to issue such laws and regulations as he saw fit and proper for the good of his church and the whole race of men, and to arrange to have these executed by his subjects here for the general good of all concerned. For this purpose he sent down the Holy Spirit to make known his will and desire to the Apostles whom he had chosen, and confirm their words with signs, and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts before the people. These special ministers through whom the revelations were made and confirmed having fully completed this part of their work needed no successors, and really could have none, this work being now finished. Like John the Baptist and Christ,

each having fully accomplished the special work of his mission, needed no successor, so these inspired ones, having revealed the whole will of the King concerning his kingdom on earth, with its privileges, immunities and blessings, and having fully confirmed their teaching as being from Christ, neither needed nor could have any successors in this work. As to their evangelic labors, the world not having been converted to Christ, they arranged for others to carry forward the good work, called evangelists, even to the end of time, that the nations who still sit in darkness may have their pathway lighted up by the Son of Righteousness, who has arisen with healing in his beams.

In all organized bodies there is first the formative state or condition; after this the regular order of things. This is true alike in the physical and spiritual realm. The vegetable and animal kingdoms, with the whole physical creation, attest this truth. First, the creation of things, then their combination into classes, or groups, or organized bodies. Then comes the regular order of things we call *nature*. So with the divine institution or organization that we call the Church of Christ. In its organization it had its special supernatural *ministry*. John the Baptist, Jesus the Christ, and the *inspired* ministry of the apostolic age; then came the regular order of things, with the regular or *permanent ministry* of the Church.

From the foregoing, therefore, we could not rationally nor scripturally expect to find the *permanent ministry* of the Church until it was established. We shall then be compelled, as all can see, in an effort to establish and settle the question under consideration—*who constitute the permanent ministry of the Church of Christ?*—to begin our investigation of the subject where and when this church was first established. But it is now generally conceded that the Church of Christ was first organized in the city of Jerusalem during the first Pentecostal feast of the Jews after Christ's ascension to heaven, as reported in the second chapter of Acts of the Apostles.

Beginning then with this portion of the Scriptures, we find that the first persons chosen and ordained to assist the apostles, or to attend upon the wants of this community of disciples, were seven men "*to serve tables*." The facts, so far as the Holy Spirit saw fit to communicate them, are as follows: "And in those days

when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said: It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicholas, a proselyte of Antioch, whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them."

Up to this time the apostles seem to have attended to everything in this first church; but now the numbers being great, and there being a distribution of goods necessary, the preaching of the gospel, the prayers with the people, and the daily ministration of temporal things to so vast a multitude, was too much labor for the twelve apostles. This division then of labor arose out of the necessity of the case; and these seven men having been chosen by their brethren under the special instruction and direction of the apostles, and having special qualifications for the work to which they were called, were *ordained, consecrated or appointed to serve tables*, or to attend to the temporalities of the church, while the apostles themselves would give all their time to the spiritual wants of the people. These seven ministers or servants of the church are the first officers or agents chosen by the church and formally ordained by the apostles. But whether this class of officers, who were thus chosen and consecrated, were to be a *permanent* order of ministers or not, does not fully appear from anything thus far made known. Hence some who have not examined with care the apostolic language here, and what is afterwards more fully revealed on this subject, have thought that these seven servants of the church at Jerusalem were only needed, and hence only chosen to this work while there should be a community of goods, out of which the wants of all were to be supplied; and finding nothing of the kind in any other church, and that in this congregation it was a voluntary matter that soon regulated itself, no one being

required by the apostles to sell his possessions and give it to the brethren, have thought *that these do not constitute a permanent class of ministers for the church.* But the observant reader will notice that the language of the apostles here clearly presents us with four things: First, that these persons were *chosen* by the members of the Church that they were to serve; second, that these persons *must have certain specified qualifications*; third, that the Apostles *appointed or ordained these men* to the work to which they were now called, by prayer and the imposition of hands; and fourth, that the work, office or labor to be performed by them was that of *serving tables*, or attending to the temporal wants of the community or Church; while the Apostles thus relieved from this duty would be enabled to devote all of their time to prayer and the ministry of the word—to the spiritual wants of the people. But the office to which these men are chosen, according to the common manner in the Jewish Synagogue, of making a choice was that of *serving tables*. The original word here rendered *serve* is the verb-form of our word *deacon*. But as this is a generic term and therefore applicable to all ministers of the Church, of whatever grade, from the Savior himself to the humblest servant of the Church, we could not from the word alone, either infer that this class of officers constitute a permanent class, or that the work to which they were called would be a permanent work in the Church; but this much is clear, that they were called and ordained to attend to the temporal wants of the brethren—the Church. If nothing after this had been said by any of the Inspired Apostles about such class of ministers, or such temporal service for the Church, we could not with any degree of certainty or satisfaction decide that this class of servants constitutes a permanent class of ministers for the Church; but, in after years, when numerous Churches had been gathered by the Apostles and evangelists in different parts of the country, we find this same term applied to a class of ministers then found in the Churches, and specific instruction given to evangelists as to their qualifications in connection with the qualifications for elders, we must conclude not only that this class of ministers was found in each well organized congregation in the Apostolic age, but that it was the intention that the evangelists, in all the coming ages, should see that every Church had this class of ministers, with the proper qualifications

selected and set apart to this needful work. Paul in writing an epistle to the Church at Philippi, about A. D., 64, addressed it "to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the *bishops* and *deacons*." There the two classes of offices, bishops or elders and deacons, are clearly recognized by the Apostle. Again, when the same Apostle is writing a letter of instruction for evangelists the following year, (1Tim 3:8) he gives quite fully the qualifications that men must have to make them eligible to the office of a *deacon*: "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their houses well. For they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

In this last communication ever made by Inspiration on this subject, we have the qualifications for this class of ministers stated clearly to the evangelist, because in his work he must set in order the things that are wanting in every Church, and see that every man chosen for a ministry is well suited to his work, office or ministry. And in this case there is no intimation that a period in the history of the Church would ever arrive, when she should not need this class of *ministers*, called Deacons. Now, while it is true that the original word used here means a *servant*, and may therefore occasionally be applied to any officer of the Church, because they are all *servants* of the Church, yet its technical use in these passages of scripture, and its specific application by the Holy Spirit to this class of officers, compell us to accept it in this special technical sense. We have, therefore, as a *permanent class of ministers* for the Church of Christ, those called by the Apostles, Deacons, whose chief service was that of serving tables, or attending to the temporal wants and interests of the Church.

Two things mentioned in this case are of sufficient importance in the discussion of this question to justify us in calling attention to them more specifically. The first is this: *that the disciples or people chose their own officers*; the second is, *that the apostles*

stated to the congregation the qualifications necessary for the office, and after the election appointed or ordained the persons chosen by prayer and fasting.

In the former case, the rights of the people even under a Christocracy is not over looked, but actually secured to them in that they are allowed to select their own ministry. But this right is limited by law; they could choose, but they must choose "men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." None others would be eligible to this office. The *election* was one thing, and was done by the "multitude of the disciples"; the *appointing* was another, and was done by the apostles. The *manner* of the appointment was prayer and the imposition of hands. The *object* was "to attend to this business"—"to serve tables." The imposition of hands in this case was to *set apart or appoint* to "this business," and had nothing to do with the conferring of Spiritual gifts, for these men were already "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." From these facts, then, we learn that prayer and the imposition of hands was the apostolic manner of ordaining persons to a sacred office. They may have *fasted* also in this case as is reported in another case, (Acts 13:3) for everything that is done on such occasions is not *always stated*; but all that *is stated, is done*. By an induction, therefore, of all the cases of ordination reported to us by the Holy Spirit, we learn what was the manner of appointment to office in the apostolic age, and we shall find that it is *fasting, prayer and the imposition of hands*.

I have been quite particular in calling the reader's attention to all the leading facts in this case, because this Jerusalem Church is a model Church in many respects, being the first Church gathered by the Holy twelve. But we shall not find anything in the apostolic teaching or practice after this that is not perfectly in harmony with their labors here. They being guided in all of their ministerial labors by the Holy Spirit, their work is perfectly unique from first to last; and they having showed the Church of Christ in this case how to select a ministry for her congregational work, and how that ministry should be consecrated, we never find them afterwards instructing the disciples on the subject. All must be made according to the pattern shown on Mount Zion.

From some facts afterwards recorded in the lives of at least two of these servants of the Jerusalem Church, we may infer that

such ministers may grow up to be public *teachers* and *preachers* in the Church, whether their office necessarily involved any instruction of the church members or not; for not long after they had been selected to this office we find Stephen publicly defending the Christian religion against the attacks of the Jews with such power and force, that "they were not able to resist the wisdom and spirit by which he spake." Being unable to meet his arguments, and sustain the claims of the Jewish religion in the controversy, they raised a mob and stoned him to death, (Acts 7.) When we recollect that the learned young lawyer, Saul of Tarsus, was engaged in this controversy and was fairly beaten by Stephen, so that he urged on the mob and held the clothes of those that stoned him to death, we may form some conception of the power of the truth then, and the wisdom and spirit of this man Stephen, the first martyr of the Christian faith. This was the beginning of that bloody persecution of the Christians, "when the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the Church." "God out of this seeming ill, educes good, and better still, and better thence again, in infinite progression." "The word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith."

Some time after this persecution and the dispersion of the whole church except the apostles, we find Philip, another one of the *seven*, who had been chosen, doing the work of an evangelist; and he is so designated in after years—"Philip the evangelist." His labors in the city of Samaria in the planting of the gospel of Christ in that center, and his conversion of the Ethiopian Eunuch, with his preaching at Azotus and other points until he reached Caesarea, are noted facts in his evangelic labors. But whether he was ever, after the dispersion of the Church at Jerusalem, ordained, as Timothy was in after years, to this sacred ministry or not, we cannot tell. So far as the record goes we have no account of such an event. Still, as everything that was done is not recorded, it is possible that he was thus sent out, as a minister of the word of life to the people.

ELDERS OR BISHOPS.

Soon after these Deacons were ordained we find in the Church a class of men styled Elders, who seem to occupy a prominent and a confidential relation to their brethren in all the churches, for

when a dearth or famine spread itself over that portion of the country, in the days of Claudius Cæsar, the disciples in Asia Minor sent relief for the brethren of Judea to the care of the *Elders*. This fact shows that they were regarded as a safe and trustworthy class of men. (Acts 11 : 30). A little later than this, in the evangelic labors of Barnabas and Paul, as they were visiting the churches that they had planted a short time before, we have this statement of their action : "And when they had *ordained them elders* in every church and prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." (Acts 14 : 23). And still a little later, we find these *elders* sitting with the apostles to decide whether Gentile christians should be circumcised and be required to keep the law of Moses or not; and their united decision is recorded by the evangelist Luke, (Acts 15 : 2-22), and shows that they were the most prominent class of officers in the Church, except the Apostles themselves.

Some time after these events occurred Paul in traveling by ship stopped for a while at Miletus, not a great way from Ephesus, and sent over to that city for the *elders* of the Church there to come and see him; and when they had arrived, he referred, in his conversation with them, to his former life and labors among them, and to the fact that he had kept nothing back from them that was profitable to them; then he said : "Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." There the Apostles for the first time in the Sacred Scriptures calls these *elders*, *overseers*, ἐπίσκοποι—the original Greek word rendered elsewhere, *bishops*. So that the facts thus far gathered not only show that these *elders* were ministers of the Church, but ministers of a very high rank—*teachers* and *overseers* of the Church of God, and that as such they must take heed to themselves and the whole congregation. The *elders* also assisted in ordaining evangelists, (1 Tim. 4 : 14).

The qualifications too for this class of officials for the church, as in the case of the deacons, are stated by Paul in his epistles to the evangelists, Timothy and Titus, and how that they were to be in all coming time the spiritual instructors and guides of the churches of Christ—overseers or bishops of the church where they lived and labored. But there is nothing to indicate that a *bishop*

watched over a number of churches, or even that *one* bishop presided over a single congregation by himself alone, but in all cases a plurality of these ministers is found in each of the apostolic churches. Such is the fact in the church at Jerusalem, in the churches over which Paul and Barnabas "ordained elders," in the Ephesian church, in the church at Philippi, and wherever their numbers are mentioned in the New Testament. There certainly, then, is no scriptural authority for placing one bishop alone over a single church, to say nothing of the assumptions of Rome and some Protestants that a bishop should have control of a whole district or diocese, in which many churches may be found located; or that still greater perversion of the apostolic model, of placing *one bishop* or Pope over all churches. Perversion in this direction could go no further. Instead of placing *one* church under a plurality of bishops, this love of power and desire to lord it over God's heritage, placed *one bishop* over all churches in all lands. Thus these human-made Popes, assuming to be the head of the Church of Christ, and to give it laws and ordinances as seemeth good to them, would "sit in the temple of God, and assume to act as God," of whom it is said, "he shall destroy them with the spirit of his mouth."

While it is true that there is nothing said in the New Testament about how the disciples elected or chose this class of ministers, the customs of the Jews in their Synagogues, and the facts recorded in the selection of the seven deacons, make it altogether probable that these were chosen in a similar manner; and it is clearly stated that they *were ordained* as were others in those times. This class of officers, called elders or bishops, with the deacons, a plurality of each in every congregation, constitute the *permanent ministry* for each local church, and meets the wants of the disciples in their individual church capacity. These were to watch over, instruct, drill and guide all the souls committed to them in things divine, for their present and eternal good, and for the salvation of those without. The church was, in this way, to be a perpetual power within herself for her own peace, joy and happiness in time and in eternity; and by the expansion of her love to grasp a world that lieth in sin. But to accomplish this latter work, since she has been made the pillar and support of the truth, she needs another class of servants or ministers, who shall

go out into the regions beyond the church precincts, into destitute and unoccupied fields, and sow the good seed of the kingdom of heaven. These the scriptures call

EVANGELISTS—MINISTERS OF THE WORD.

This class of officers, in her efforts to convert the world to Christ, becomes at once the most prominent and important class of *permanent servants* before the world that the church has. They go out with the authority of the church vested in them as her ministers, to bear the gospel everywhere to the lost and perishing sons of men, and therefore should be to the world true and noble specimens of her knowledge and spirit, of her piety and humanity, of her love and zeal for the cause of the Master, and of her sacrifices for the truth of God, and of her noble, manly bearing before all men. Hence the Scriptures present us with "Luke the beloved physician," with "the brother whose praise in the gospel is throughout all the churches," and Timothy "as one well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium," as specimens of this class of servants. Such are "to war a good warfare; holding faith and a good conscience;" "to be examples to the believers in word, in behavior, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." They are "to take heed unto themselves and unto the doctrine; continue in them, for in doing this they will both save themselves, and those that hear them." They are "to do nothing by partiality." They are "to lay hands suddenly on no one, lest they be partakers of other men's sins; they are to keep themselves pure." They are, "to follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness; fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto they are called, and have professed a good profession before many witnesses." Such are some of the qualifications and characteristics that are necessary to make this class of ministers a success in their noble calling.

Each evangelist should labor earnestly, that he himself may fill the requirements made by the Holy Spirit, and fulfill his ministry with joy and not with grief. The Church, too, should be careful not to entrust so important a part of her business to either careless or incompetent men. Too much is at stake in this divine work of trying to save souls, to allow either incompetent, impious, or careless persons to go out with the authority of the church. These are the church's general agents or ministers, sent out for the

conversion of sinners, the planting of new churches, and the setting in order of the things that may be wanting in the churches. They act for the church as her general agents in extending the borders of Zion; and hence, in the planting of new churches, all offices necessary for their establishment and growth, up to a certain point, when other ministers sufficiently qualified for their respective works may be selected, center in them by virtue of their calling. It is therefore a most responsible and sacred work, into which no one should rush unadvisedly or hastily; nor without the hearty concurrence of many of his peers that know him and believe him to be suited to this ministry. A little more care here would remedy many of the evils that the church has to encounter in many sections, and soon be the means of saving largely the losses that have heretofore been sustained. It is very manifest that in many sections of country, at least, we have not yet attained to the apostolic requirements and model in these matters. We may therefore expect confusion and disorder frequently to arise in all churches where they do not heed the instruction of the Great Head of the church, in so important a matter as the ministry. The epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus are evidently the instructions specifically furnished for this class of ministers, as much as the epistles to the churches found in the New Testament, furnish the instruction for the church members to the end of time. So these epistles furnish ample instruction for evangelists, in all of their varied duties and fields of labor, to the coming of Christ. Thus we can, with the inspired Peter, say, "God by his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness."

As to the *selection* and *consecration* of evangelists to their sacred ministry, we have in the New Testament the following facts: The church at Jerusalem first sent out Barnabas, whose conversion and full consecration with all that he had to the Savior are recorded in these words: "And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The Son of Consolation), a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, having land sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet." (Acts 4:36, 37.) After this disciple had for some time worshiped with this congregation, and had evidently exhibited fair talent as a public preacher and teacher, in connection with true piety and

nobleness of heart; and when those who had fled from the persecution that cost Stephen his life, had preached the word in Phœnicia and in Cyprus, and at Antioch, in such a way as that many were turned to the Lord Jesus; "and when tidings of these things had come to the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem, they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch; who, when he was come, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they cleave unto the Lord. For he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith; and much people was added unto the Lord." Acts 11:22.

After spending a year or so in labors for the brethren at Antioch with Saul, and had with him made a tour up to Jerusalem with a contribution for the poor saints in Judea, and then returned to Antioch, it is said: "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that is called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Acts 13:1.

We have in the case of this *first* evangelist selected and sent out by the disciples, a very remarkable case indeed. Remarkable in several things: First, that two of the largest and most noted churches of that age coöperated in selecting and sending out Barnabas as a minister, missionary, evangelist or apostle of the church of Christ. Second, that after he had been for some years educated and trained in the christian religion in the home church, he was sent out to labor for more than a year before the Holy Spirit ordered him set apart to the work whereunto he was called. Third, that Saul, who was called directly by the Savior himself as one of his apostles, was ordered to be ordained by the ministry of the Antioch church. Fourth, that the ordination was by fasting, prayer and the imposition of hands. Fifth, that the persons ordaining by the imposition of hands were not apostles, but only ministers of the church at Antioch, and could not therefore confer any spiritual gifts upon the persons thus ordained. These I say are all remarkable facts and worthy of note by those who would seek to restore the apostolic christianity of the New Testament.

Even Saul of Tarsus, having been called to the apostolic office after the church was established, must needs be "set apart to the work whereunto the Holy Ghost had called him, by fasting, prayer and the imposition of the hands of ministering brethren."

Timothy, a young man in the church at Derbe or Lystra, being well reported of by the brethren of Lystra and Iconium, (Acts 16:1), was taken by Paul in his ministerial labors, and at some time, not mentioned, ordained by him and an eldership, called in the common version of the scriptures, the presbytery. (1 Tim. 4:14.) Titus, who was left on the island of Crete to set in order the things that were wanting in the churches there, and to ordain elders in every city, was to ordain them as he had been *appointed* by Paul—*διατάσσω*, rendered ordain in 1 Cor. 7:17 and 9:14, and Timothy was ordered to lay hands suddenly on no one lest he should be a partaker of other men's sins.

These facts show us (a) that the evangelists of the apostolic age were selected, so far as reported by a plurality of churches, and after being fully tested as to their fitness for the work were solemnly ordained to the work of the ministry; (b) that so far as the Holy Spirit has communicated the facts, the ordination was by fasting, prayer, and the imposition of the hands of those present, who were ministering to the church at the time; (c) that evangelists are in turn to set in order what may be wanting in churches and ordain elders having certain specified qualifications; (d) and that there is no intimation that this or any other part of their work should cease to the end of time. While there are many evangelists mentioned by name in the New Testament, and their work fully presented in the apostolic labors in spreading the gospel in their day, and in the instructions to evangelists in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, yet there is but the one full description of their consecration to their work in the New Testament, as I have presented it in the case of Barnabas and Saul. It certainly was not necessary in this case, any more than in the selection of the local ministry, to state facts more than once for all time. In the case of the seven selected to serve in the first church, we had a very full account as to how to select and ordain the local ministry; and in the case of Barnabas, the first evangelist selected and sent out as a missionary from the church, we have a full account of the Spirit's directions, and the action of the brethren

in ordaining him to his ministry. This is a sufficient directory for all time in this matter.

By this induction of facts from the New Testament after the church was established, we learn that there are three classes of permanent officers in the church, constituting her permanent ministry.

I. Deacons, who "serve tables" and attend to the distribution of the temporal blessings and benefices provided by the church for her needy ones, to watch over the financial interests of the church. In doing this they necessarily become a species of teachers of their brethren, in providing means for "every good work"; they thus "purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith."

II. The second class are called Elders, or Bishops; whose duty it is to keep an oversight of the whole congregation; and especially instruct, protect, guide and guard all the saints in the divine life. To protect and defend the doctrine and faith of the Church against false teachers and men of perverse minds. To watch for souls, and so govern and direct the body that every member thereof shall perform its proper functions for the general good of the whole, and for the conversion of the world. This, before God and all the people, is a most responsible office, and hence, "he that desireth the office of a bishop, desireth a good work."

These two classes of ministers constitute the *permanent* ministry of the *local church* of each congregation. So far as we have any revelation on the subject, there are to be a plurality of each class in every well organized church. Reason, as well as revelation, says, these two classes of ministers are all that are needed for the local congregation and work. But to accomplish another great mission assigned to the church by her Head, the conversion of the world, we have found that another class of servants became necessary; a class, who went out as heralds of the cross of Christ, to spread abroad "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," and to "turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in Christ."

III. These from their work are styled Evangelists, or using another word from the Greek tongue, they are the *apostles* of the

church ; or should we prefer a word from the Latin, they are *missionaries*, *messengers* or *ministers* of the church. Their work we have seen is a very comprehensive one. Preaching the Gospel ; baptizing the believers ; gathering and watching over new congregations ; strengthening the weak ones ; setting in order the things that are wanting in the churches ; stimulating and encouraging the brethren to engage in all good works ; to ordain ministers ; to reprove and rebuke with all authority as the servants of the church and her agents ; and to keep a general watch-care over all the churches.

This class of officers fills up that which was wanting to make the system of Christianity complete, as a self-preserving and an all-conquering power among the nations. She, by her local ministry is to hold all she gains, and by her evangelists constantly conquer new territory for the King ; gathering new subjects from all lands, until "the kingdoms of this world shall all become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Anointed ; and he shall reign forever and ever." As it is written by John the beloved : "And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard as it were, the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying : Alleluia : for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

We have also learned that each of these classes of servants of the church, after being chosen or recommended by the brethren, were then formally and orderly *set apart*, each to his respective ministry, by fasting, prayer and the imposition of the hands of apostles, evangelists or elders, or by a joint co-operation of two of these classes ; that the instruction to evangelists requires them to commit to faithful men what they have received, but to lay hands suddenly upon no one, lest they should be partakers of other men's sins ; and finally, that there is no intimation in the Sacred Scriptures that this form of ordination should ever cease in the church. This was, therefore, the form of ordination to be retained and practiced in the Church of Christ to the end of time.

A. E. MYERS.

THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL.

PART II.

CORRUPTION OF THE SIMPLICITY.

"There be some who trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ."—
Galatians 1:7.

In the April number of this magazine, I defended the thesis that the gospel of Christ is a simple system of divine truth, drawing my arguments from the simplicity of Christ, and the plainness of his teaching; from the simplicity of the apostles and their teaching; from the correlation of divine power and human ability; from the simplicity of the ceremonial ordinances, viz.: Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Manual Ordination; from the worship presented in the New Testament, and from the government prescribed by the apostles for the church in all ages.

In accordance with my plan, I proceed to point out the Corruption of this Simplicity: to show the various departures from plain, simple truth as uttered by the Master of christian thought, and by the messengers whom he sent into all the world; the departures from the spirit form and intention of the ordinances—from the worship and from the government of the church. I desire to note the historical development of these departures; to indicate the philosophy of the defection, and to hold up the true and good as they are in Christ, against the false and evil as they are in Antichrist.

It is evident to any thinking mind that as the simplicity of the gospel must be sustained by a rigid adherence to the whole teaching of Christ and the apostles, so the corruption or perversion of the gospel can be brought about by drifting away from that divine teaching and falling in with the errors and traditions of men.

I remark then, in general, that the integrity of the gospel can be impaired and its great purposes perverted by

1. A misconception of the teaching of the Saviour and his apostles concerning the fundamental principles of the system propounded to the mind for acceptance, and the consequent adoption of a system of error.

2. An erroneous view of the active powers of the mind, such as Faith, Repentance, Obedience, etc.

3. A corruption of the ordinances.

4. Corruption of the worship of the church.

5. Corruption of the government of the church.

An extended discussion of all these matters would transcend the limits of an essay for a quarterly journal. I am, therefore, compelled to be brief. Adhering closely to the method just sketched I begin my examination by noticing:

- a. **THE MISCONCEPTION OF INSPIRED TEACHING, TOUCHING OBJECTIVE TRUTH, AND THE ADOPTION OF ERROR.**

A few prominent points are given as specimens. The reader may notice and study in order the following: 1. Human Depravity and Moral Inability. 2. The Trinity. 3. Election. 4. Regeneration.

HUMAN DEPRAVITY AND MORAL INABILITY.

The two are inseparable. They stand to each other as cause and effect. Depravity is the cause; inability, the effect. Here we all agree; but lo! how we differ. Let us examine. The doctrine of the apostles on the subject of Human Depravity is very clear. That doctrine sets forth the truth that man is a depraved being—depraved in intellect, morals, and will—and that he can become worse and worse, and finally sink so low in moral degradation that it becomes impossible to save him.

The doctrine of the Papal Doctors (Augustine and others) insists upon total hereditary depravity, nowhere taught in the Bible.

The doctrine of the apostles touching moral inability shows very plainly that the world by wisdom does not and cannot know God—that man, by mere human ability, cannot find out the Almighty—that Intuition cannot discover the divine being, that Emotion cannot discover Christ; but that human intellect and human emotion, aided by the teaching of God's prophets, can

come to God through Christ—believe him, love him, and obey him.

The doctrine of the Papal College, and of all who follow their teaching, is that man by reason of depravity is so completely unable to approach God, that God's omnipotence is necessary to draw him. No moral suasion of God's word is adequate to lift man from the pit of inability.

All the christian fathers, all the reformers, advocated this view of Depravity and Inability, and so do nine-tenths of modern preachers; not one of them seems to think that it dishonors God and debases man; not one of them can see that it presents the spectacle of the Holy One of the Universe throwing aside all moral means and agencies, treating man as a poor animal destitute of moral sensibilities, and drawing man by omnipotent force. The doctrine as set forth by the apostles, is true; as set forth by Patristic, Papal and Protestant Colleges, is false. "No man cometh unto me except the Father draw him. Every one that hath heard of the Father and hath learned of him cometh unto me."—John 6:44-45.

THE TRINITY.

The teaching of Christ and the Apostles concerning the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, involving the absolute divinity of Christ and the mission of the Spirit to the church, is clear, plain, simple and intelligible. The teaching of Papacy as developed in councils, and expressed in their theological works, is obscure, complex and unintelligible. Nine-tenths of the Protestant world adopt the mysticism of Babylon on this subject. They prefer Papal to Christian Trinity. We accept the Trinity as taught by the apostles and by the teacher of the apostles. It is orthodox. We reject the Trinity as taught by the school-men of Rome. It is heterodox.

ELECTION.

The teaching of the apostles on the subject of election shows us very clearly that God elects every man who obeys the gospel; elects him after he has obeyed, not before, and that he becomes an elect one by means of "sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." The teaching of the Heresiarchs is that God made his election before the creation of man, and all Calvinistic Protestants follow in the wake. The Petro-Pauline doctrine is cor-

rect. The Augustino-Calvinistic doctrine is erroneous: The one is Christ—the other, Antichrist.

REGENERATION.

The teaching of the Master and His Apostles on this subject shows that it is a complex process, beginning in Faith, progressing in Repentance, and closing in Baptism. The teaching of the Papal schools and, so far as we know, all the popular Protestant schools, is that Regeneration precedes faith, and is a mystic movement of divine power—a direct act of God.

Dr. Hodge, Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton, a representative Calvinist of the nineteenth century for Europe and America, in his last and ablest work, says: "The Scriptures not only teach that regeneration is the work of the immediate omnipotent agency of the spirit, but they give such an account of its nature as admits of no other explanation of its cause. It is a kind of work which nothing but almighty power can accomplish. It is a *ζωοποιήσις*, a making alive. This is an act of God, for he alone can give life. [The word that I speak unto you is spirit and life.—Jesus.] Brackets—ours. B. Lazarus was raised from the dead by the power of God. So are the regenerated. Spiritual resurrection is just as really and literally an act of making alive as calling a dead body to life. It is a work not of divine efficiency operating by moral suasion or any second causes, but of the immediate and almighty power of God." If Dr. H. be correct, what shall we say of the following?

"Of his own will begat he as by the word of truth."—James. "Being born not of corruptible but of incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever."—Peter. Here are the two teachings. Which shall we take? One is given by inspired, the other by uninspired men. One is orthodox, the other heterodox.

Orthodoxy is Christ. Heterodoxy is Antichrist. The scriptures do not require a man to discuss and believe these "points of doctrine" but they do require him to believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." God proposes to save the ignorant as well as the wise.

b. An erroneous view of the active power of the mind, such as Faith, Repentance, Obedience, &c., and the consequent moral

relation of the Christian to God and Christ, to his fellow christians, and to society at large.

The perversion of Faith commenced at an early period. Christianity is divine unity. It is the beauty of holiness, the sublimity of thought, the compassion of feeling, and the majesty of law. All its principles are parts of one stupendous whole. It was made for man—fallen man—intellectual man—a moral agent—a responsible being. It is man added to revelation; man believing, obeying, worshipping God. How can man believe in God unless he hear God? How can he hear God without a preacher? How can one preach unless he be sent? How can he be sent without the authority of Christ? Will the reader fall back to the first century and let the ear of his mind hear the preachers when Christ sent the apostles; the only infallible preachers that have ever spoken on earth since the ascension of Christ. Soon after the death of the Christ and the apostles, grievous wolves entered in among the disciples; men arose, speaking perverse things, drawing away the mind from the simplicity of the truth to the jargon of vain and foolish philosophy. The whole system of Christianity was, in the course of time, perverted; and amid the wreck, made by men, *faith* shared the common fate. Apostolic intellectualism gave way to patristic mysticism. Itching ears listened to fables. Systems crumbled and superstition asserted its power. Truth was crushed and Error raised its head.

All the falsities of Protestant theology have sprung from the man of sin, who has been contending against Christ for eighteen centuries, dictating doctrine, discipline and government to the religious world, acquiring and wielding power over the hearts and consciences of men, subversive of moral liberty; asserting prerogatives incompatible with the divine constitution, and demoralizing humanity more than the sensualism of Mohammed.

This apostle of error boldly asserts the incapacity of the mind to comprehend the simple truths of the gospel, and reserves the right of construction, dictation and legislation. The great truth running throughout the whole Bible, and finding response in the mental constitution of man, that faith is the belief of a proposition sustained by evidence, is denied by the Papacy, and this denial has been sustained by a large majority of Protestant teachers.

These teachers contemplate God as a Creator, and forget that he is a Law-giver. They view the soul of man as a complete chaos; an insensate rock, not possessing even vegetative sensation. A human being, in their estimation, is a mere conglomeration of human body and demon spirit, and is from birth a compound of evil things, not unlike the poisonous mixture in the witch's cauldron :

"Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,
Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting,
Lizard's leg, and owlet's wing,
Liver of blaspheming Jew ;
Gall of goat, and slips of yew."

Out of such a mass of corruption it would indeed be impossible to make a Christian. All the apostles associated, and preaching the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, could not make any impression on such a monster, and it is quite certain that God has never directed a prophet to operate upon such material.

Oh, when will men learn that the word of God leads the mind to faith and that the goodness of God leads to repentance ? When will they learn that the voice of God, uttered from the mountains of the Holy Land and the plains of Jordan, proclaims aloud that man is the subject of law—that law is a rule of action—that a rule of action necessitates a voluntary intelligent agent capable of hearing, receiving and obeying the ruler. Every law given by God, whether through Moses or Christ, implies capacity on the part of man to submit to legislation ; every command of the Decalogue, every precept of Christ, every injunction of an apostle of Christ, presupposes the moral ability of the free moral agents to whom such commands, precepts and injunctions were delivered. Is not divine influence a system of *inducement* ? "We love him because he first loved us." He *induces* us by love. "He promises us eternal life." We are *induced* by the promise to become partakers of the divine nature, and to seek for glory, honor, and immortality.

Christ tells us that in His Father's house are many mansions, and He says, "I go to prepare a place for you." Can we not be *induced* to love him and serve Him in order to gain a residence in those mansions ?

INDUCEMENT IS GOD'S METHOD.

"Guide me, O thou Great Jehovah"; guide me by thy word, by thy providence, by thy love, by thy law, by thy Son, and by

His apostles. Draw me, O Father, by thy kind voice inviting me to glory; draw me, and I will run after thee.

If the premises of the Augustine theology be correct, then the reasoning and the conclusion are correct, and we are found false witnesses, and with us the apostles are false witnesses. We have said, with Peter and Paul, that "faith comes by hearing," while Augustine and all his followers, Papal and Protestant, declare that it comes by infusion—divine coercion. We have said that it is the active movement of an intelligent moral agent; they say it is a grace imparted to a passive soul incapable of excitement by motives. We have learned from the sacred oracles that God affords testimony in abundance concerning His Son, to induce men to believe in Him; they have no use for such testimony, and refer the exercise of faith wholly to omnipotent power. We have learned that faith purifies the heart; they insist that the heart must first be purified by direct spiritual influence before faith can be evolved. We have learned that faith is the initiative movement in regeneration; they declare that regeneration precedes faith. Our whole course of reading and thinking on this subject, drawn from the scriptures, is in direct opposition to the prevailing opinions and sentiments of the vast majority of theologians of the past fifteen centuries. But human majorities are not always right; indeed they are generally wrong. In a true scale of theology the apostles and their Master will draw down the beam heavy, while "Fathers," "Reformers," Popes, Cardinals, Bishops and Archbishops, the world over, placed in the other scale, "will rise and kick the beam."

I shall now present a few select passages from the sermons and essays of representative men of the eighteen christian centuries of the world's history, with a view of fully substantiating what has been said in reference to Corruption.

My first quotation is taken from one of the "One Hundred Short Sermons," by H. I. Thomas, Canon of the Cathedral of Liege, Belgium: endorsed by Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore. The view here given has been adopted by all the Popes of Rome and their ministers for more than a thousand years.

"Faith is a gift of God and a *supernatural virtue*, by which we firmly believe in God and all the truths which the church teaches, because God, who reveals them, is truth itself. It comes

not from ourselves ; it is not our production. We can never have it in our hearts except through God's goodness and liberality. It is supernatural ; we cannot acquire it by the exercise of our intellectual or moral powers ; it can come only direct from heaven. The very day in which you became Christians, and received the gift of faith at the baptismal font, there were millions of children born throughout the world who had not the same happiness you had. All the dogmas of the Holy Catholic Church are true and ought to be accepted by faith even against the testimony of the senses, or the judgment of reason.

You must believe, and believe *firmly*, and never stop to doubt or enquire into a dogma of the church."

Such are the enunciations of a distinguished Doctor of the Romish Church, and they are endorsed by all the bishops and archbishops of the most powerful religious body on the face of the globe. Two hundred and fifty millions of living Catholics say amen to every assertion of Canon Thomas : aye, further, the opinion published in his sermon, from which this extract is taken, is styled the orthodox opinion and unalterable decree of all the councils of the Papacy for at least thirteen centuries. What a majority ! What absurdity ! What credulity ! This irrational philosophy concerning faith has ruled the religious world during all the ages of the christian epoch. It seems remarkable that any man endowed with intellect could utter such senseless jargon, and it is just as remarkable that any man of sense could believe the falsehood. Did ever maniac in an asylum assert anything more outrageously ridiculous than that a babe at baptism, incapable of reasoning, receives the gift of faith, whereby it firmly believes in God and the truths of the Catholic Church ? Did Canon Thomas, himself, believe it ? If he did, he was demented. If he did not, he was simply engaged in publishing one of the many credulities of his church, on the principle that the end justifies the means. The difference between a babe and a man, in the estimation of the Canon, is this : A babe has no reason, and yet believes firmly in God at the baptismal font. A man has reason in great abundance, but it must be set aside in order that he may believe. And thus is fulfilled, according to this learned prelate, in the scripture which says, "Ye must become as little children before you can be converted."

The teaching of Canon Thomas on this subject is the teaching of all the Catholic ministry from Saint Augustine to Archbishop Purcell. It is a perversion of all truth; a contradiction of the Holy Spirit; a bold dispute with the Almighty; a denial of Christ. John was right when he said, "These things were written that ye might believe"; Paul was right when he said, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"; Peter was right when he said, "God made choice among us that the Gentiles, by my mouth, should hear the word of God, the word of the gospel, and believe; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith."

Leaving the Canon and all his brethren in the mire of mysticism, I pass on to notice the Protestant theory of faith.

MARTIN LUTHER'S CONCEPTION.

Luther was a grand man. I honor him. But he was a mystic. It was almost impossible for him to give up all the errors of Rome. He adhered to "Divine Presence in the Eucharist," and called it consubstantiation; he adhered to "mystic faith," and called it supernatural grace. In his sermon entitled "The Method and Fruits of Justification," he says, "It is faith alone that justifies thee, thou being endued therewith by the Spirit, which changes the man, makes him anew, and gives him another reason and another will." The whole process, in the estimation of the great Reformer, is supernatural, hyper-moral and extra-scriptural. The theory of Luther was adopted by all the reformers, German and French.

Passing over from the Continent I notice briefly the Scotch and British Theology.

ERSKINE'S VIEW.

Ralph Erskine was one of the great lights of the Scotch pulpit, and may be contemplated as a representative man. His view of faith may be gathered from the following passages taken from a discourse in 1725, from the text: "And unto Him shall the gathering of the people be." Gen. 49:10.

"In this gathering the souls act believably. There is a spiritual internal principle from which the man acts, even the Spirit of God as the main, and the new heart as the subordinate principle of faith in the man. The Spirit's inhabitation may be known by the actings of the graces of the Spirit, such as faith, love, etc.

There is no gathering to Him without a draft of omnipotency. Draw me. There is the almighty, irresistible, direct power. *We will run.* There is the motion of the soul."

Erskine declares that faith, as well as other operations of the mind, comes by irresistible, direct omnipotency; Paul declares that it comes by hearing. Rom. 10:17.

Erskine says that God draws by direct, immediate power; Christ says that His Father draws by hearing and learning. John 6:45. Who is right?

This notion of faith is sustained by John Knox, Robert Walker, Thomas Chalmers, Edward Irving, and the whole body of Scotch ministers; by Wickliffe, Chillingworth, Baxter, Bunyan, Tillotson, Barrow, of England; and by Jeremy Taylor and Carson of Ireland. Quotations are unnecessary.

Crossing the Atlantic in our survey we will contemplate for a while the American pulpit.

THEORY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS.

Among the distinguished defenders of passivity—divine and direct illumination preceding faith—this great American metaphysician stands preëminent. In his work on the "Affections," he says: "God gives his Spirit to the sinner to be united to the faculties of the soul and to dwell there as a principle of spiritual life and activity. The mind thus endued with grace—direct from God—is possessed of a new nature, and is then made capable of believing in Chsist.

PRINCETON DIVINITY.

Drs. Wood, Alexander, and Hodge have been regarded for fifty years past, as the three great representative men of Princeton and its theology. As accomplished scholars, as defenders of their peculiar faith, as high-minded, conscientious men, they are entitled to profound respect. As interpreters of the word of God they are obnoxious to criticism. They all sustain Dr. Edwards, and declare their conviction that "the soul is passive in regeneration," and that this theory is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Standards. (Biblical Repertory, *passim*).

DANVILLE DIVINITY.

Dr. Breckenridge, in his massive work on "The Knowledge of God," gives us nine points of doctrine touching the moral renovation of man. From these an extract will be presented, taken from

the fourth, eighth and ninth. "In this work of divine renovation man is wholly passive. The Holy Spirit is the sole efficient agent, and it is the immediate act of God, a sovereign act of the creator." (Knowledge of God, Vol. II, pp. 156, 157.)

The learned Doctor defends the doctrine of infantile faith, and says: "Why may not the work of the Spirit be effectual in it? Why may it not be united to Christ and have communion with Him in grace as well as in glory? To say that it cannot believe in Christ is to say far more than we know." (Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 258.)

STEPHEN OLIN,

"The Chalmers of the Methodist church," presents the same view. In a discourse on "Faith as the great want of the soul," he says: "Now the great proofs on which the gospel relies are demonstrations made to the moral perceptions of man and are altogether independent of logic and metaphysics. *The true light shines into all hearts directly from God.*"

It is scarcely necessary to say that Dr. Olin is sustained in this view by all the bishops and subordinate ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States; and that the practice of this zealous people, whom they represent, of praying for the descent of the Holy Spirit to enlighten the mind and give faith to the sinner is in strict accordance with their theory. Honesty and error are often associated.

VIEW OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH.

The following brief extract from the Confession of Faith, adopted by this denomination some years ago, presents very clearly the doctrine of this religious body.

"We believe that in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated; that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind; that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension, by the power of the Holy Spirit in connection with the truth; that repentance and faith are inseparable graces wrought in our souls by the regenerating spirit of God."

Such is an outline view of the departures from the Christian system established by the apostles, beginning with Tertullian and coming on down in "regular succession" through Augustine, the Catholic Confederacy, the German, French, Scotch, English, and American protestant pulpit. Most of our living preachers, are

simply copyists. They reproduce the thoughts of the masters who have gone before them, and take it for granted that they are the thoughts of God. They are honest men, but, are they not honestly mistaken? Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind.

I now proceed to notice briefly

C. THE CORRUPTION OF THE ORDINANCES.

Baptism is one of the simplest and most expressive ordinances of divine appointment. To indicate the departures from apostolic simplicity in reference to this ordinance, I present the following condensed view. The distribution of the subject under four heads is convenient, viz: 1. Action; 2. Subject; 3. Administrator, and 4. Design.

For further convenience let us adopt the words *normal* and *abnormal*. Now examine the following:

1. Action: Normal, Immersion. Abnormal, Sprinkling, Pouring, etc.

2. Subject: Normal, Believing, Penitent. Abnormal, Infants.

3. Administrator: Normal, Appointee of a Church. Abnormal, Priest or Preacher only.

4. Design: Normal, Remission of Sins. Abnormal, Accompanying grace of Regeneration to infant—and discharge of Christian duty to adult.

This is a tabular view which every intelligent reader can understand. The *normal* is Christ; the *abnormal* anti-Christ.

The Lord's Supper is remarkable for its plainness and simplicity, as I have stated in the first part of this essay; and as all very well know who read the New Testament. The two great departures from the divine rule can be very easily expressed. The Scriptures teach weekly communion and commemoration; human wisdom prescribes convenient time and transubstantiation.

Manual Ordination, as we have seen, is simply a visible and public induction into office. The ordaining party is the congregation by the hands of an appointee or appointees, at home or from abroad; and the ordained party an elder, deacon or evangelist. The former confers, the latter accepts office, and this is all. Now the corruption of this simple ceremony consists in establishing sacerdotal power and sacerdotal grace. "Let grace and power flow

from my sanctified fingers and flow into this kneeling candidate's head." "I am a regular descendant from Peter, Paul, James and John." So says the Diocesan bishop. Ordination by a regular ordained minister only sounds to my ear very much like apostolic succession; hence a large number of the Protestant denominations, beside the Episcopal and Lutheran, virtually contend for apostolic succession. Practiced in a plain, simple, apostolic way, it is Christ; practiced in the style of Rome and all its imitations, it is anti-Christ.

Such, in brief, are the most prominent departures from the simplicity of the gospel touching the ordinances. Such are the proclivities of the human mind when it forgets God; wanders off in mysticism, and will not have the infallible teachers whom God has appointed to impart instruction and guide it into all truth. Israel said, "We have loved idols, and we will go after them." Professed followers of Christ have been saying the same thing for nearly eighteen centuries.

d. CORRUPTION OF THE WORSHIP.

Let any man of intelligence read carefully the New Testament and observe the plain, simple directions given by Christ and the apostles touching the worship of God; then take into his hands a "Missal," "Ritual," or a "Key of Heaven" and he can soon satisfy himself on this subject. He will find that an overwhelming majority of the religious world of civilization have corrupted the way of the Lord. From one of these standard works I make the following extracts: "Thou shalt confess thy sins to a priest. Thou shalt keep the feast of the Epiphany. Thou shalt keep the feast of the Annunciation. Thou shalt keep the feast of the Ascension. We fly to thy patronage, O sacred mother of God; despise not our prayers, but deliver us from danger. Blessed angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, saints and martyrs, pray for the departed, and deliver them from the pains and torments of purgatory."

It is due to the Protestant world to acknowledge that in many things it has done well. Most Protestant communions have dispensed with the leading iniquities of Popery; but it is quite evident that Protestantism needs a little reforming in the department of worship, as well as in Christian Psychology. If Protestants are willing to worship the God in spirit and in truth; to assemble

on the first day of the week, commemorating the death of Christ, making melody in their hearts to the Lord by psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, praying with earnest supplication to the Lord, offering continually the sacrifice of praise from humble and contrite hearts then will they unite in dispensing with responsive prayers from polluted lips, and concert singing from voices that have never confessed Christ. It cannot be denied that in nine tenths of the large and fashionable church assemblies of the cities of the United States, the only purpose of the people is to pass away an hour in recreation. God is not in any of their thoughts. God is not worshipped. "This people draweth nigh unto me with their lips, but their heart is far from me."

Worship may be corrupted by adding to it unauthorized forms, subtracting from it that which is authorized by divine law; and, still further, by attending to the divine order without engaging the heart.

The seven sacraments of the Papacy in connection with all their prayers give illustration to the first; the repudiation of baptism by many Protestant sects illustrate the second; and the wide spread, cold, heartless formalism illustrates the third. One is forcibly reminded of the word of the Lord by Isaiah: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? Bring no more vain oblation; incense is an abomination unto me. When ye spread forth your hands I will hide mine eyes from you: when ye make many prayers I will not hear." If we enquire why was all this terrible denunciation, we find the answer given by the prophet. "Your hands are full of blood," (you are impure). Hence "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well."

e. CORRUPTION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

About one hundred years ago Dr. George Campbell pointed out very accurately *the Five Steps of the Hierarchy*.

First step: From congregational episcopacy to parochial episcopacy.

Second step: From parochial episcopacy to diocesan episcopacy.

Third step: From diocesan episcopacy to metropolitan supremacy.

Fourth step: From metropolitan supremacy to patriarchal superintendency.

Fifth step: From patriarchal superintendency to papal supremacy.

Such is a condensed view of the progressive movement from the close of the apostolic age to the middle of the fifth century, beginning with the plain, God-fearing *overseer* of a single congregation, hated of men, and persecuted for righteousness' sake, and culminating in the election of an ecclesiastical tyrant, swaying his sceptre over scores of bishops, hundreds of preists, thousands of deacons, and millions of laymen.

This system of sacerdotalism still reigns throughout the world. The Roman, Greek and Anglican churches exhibit it in all its power; and Protestant churches, not connected with the State, manifest altogether too much of its baneful influence. Complete emancipation from Rome by all Protestants has not yet occurred; and just as they hold on to mystic faith and infant affusion, so they cling to high notions of priestly power and prerogative. The simplicity of Christ is not dreamed of in their philosophy of church government.

Sessions; courts, low and high; conventions; coferences; associations; all—all are liable to err—have errred, and will continue to err unless they accept without emendation the great principle avowed by the Protestant world—“*The word of God is a sufficient rule of Faith and Practice.*”

No reasonable objection can be offered to conventions, conferences, assemblies or associations, provided such assemblies be conducted in strict accordance with the principles of government laid down in the teaching of the apostles. Whenever it can be shown that a certain course of action or policy is contrary to the teaching of the Holy Spisit, it should be abandoned, or rather, it should not be adopted. Let Christ dwell in the hearts and heads of men in convention; let the Christ-power prevail, and man-power go under, and all will be right. No assembly has a right to legislate; but any legal assembly may execute the legislative action of Christ and the apostles. All the law making of ecclesiastic legislatures is contrary to the word of the Lord. Christ recognizes no Legislative Assembly on earth. The law of the Lord is perfect. God-inspired scripture is competent for all instruction in faith, morals, manners, worship and government.

I reserve what I have to say on the Restoration of Simplicity

—the danger of falling into Corruption—and the duty of pleading for the simplicity in Christ, until the October number.

WM. J. BARBER.

THE TENDENCY OF PROTESTANTISM.

The reader will notice that we have discreetly put the word *Tendency* at the head of this article. It would have been pleasanter to use *goal*, or *final result*, or *ultimate outcome*, or some other sonorous phrase indicative of an assured consummation, but we could not venture so far. We may stand upon the river's brink and note from the ripple of its water and the gliding of its drift, that it is moving—and moving in a certain direction—but how soon and how often it may change that direction and sweep to the right or the left, or even turn, serpent-like, back upon itself, we may not know, and it were hazardous to say. In like manner, when we give thoughtful attention to that great complexity which we call Protestantism, with all of its intellectual, moral, religious, and ecclesiastical forces, we cannot fail to perceive the steady onflowing of its grand current. Evidently it is going—somewhere. It has not reached its destiny. It has not finished its work. It has not fulfilled its mission. Moreover, it appears conscious of its condition, or, rather, it seems to feel the influence of an irresistible power urging it forward. It cannot rest, and it does not. Its *dolce far niente*, if it is ever to enjoy it, is yet future. At present all is life, enterprise, activity—a watchful, eager pressing on towards—something.

Let us try to appreciate this condition of Protestantism, and see if we can ascertain the direction in which it is at present moving; and although we may not be able as yet to perceive the end to which it is tending, we may still find enough to encourage our faith and warm our zeal.

We note, in the first place, that the great separate ecclesiastical organizations in which it has ever presented itself, seem outwardly to be as compact and distinct as in the past. There is no

indication, for example, that the Methodist Discipline is gradually taking on the hue and color of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, or *vice versa*; no sign of any breaking down of the old middle walls of partition between the Baptists and Episcopalians; indeed there is little or no formulated change anywhere, in faith, doctrine, organization or discipline. The Methodist still clings to his Bishops, his Presiding Elders, and his Class-Leaders; the Presbyterian holds fast to his Ruling Elders, his Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, and he speaks of these church "courts" in the same terms, if not in the same tones, that he did in days gone by. The Episcopalian is fully persuaded that "order is Heaven's first law," and that without a Diocesan Bishop and Parochial Priests and Deacons, scriptural "order" *non est*. His Book of Common Prayer, too, is still regarded as containing the true exposition of all essential scriptural doctrine, and as being alike exquisite in taste and sound in teaching. The creeds and the thirty-nine articles of religion maintain their old place in the book and also, it is to be presumed, in the heads and hearts of most of those who worship with it. The Baptist has not yielded an inch of ground on his "mode" and "subject," while the Pædo-Baptist continues to insist that the baptism of little children must by all means be retained in the church. So with the Lutherans, the Congregationalists, the Dutch Reformed, and many minor sects—they all retain the impress of the mold into which they were originally cast, and, *prima facie*, it would appear that no change, no growth, no internal movement, was taking place.

In truth, however, this is far from being the case. In one and all of them the men and women, the real living constituents of these churches have been surely, though it may have been slowly, changing. A sort of liberalizing influence has been at work upon them. A larger, freer, better understanding of the Bible has been reached by them. They may retain the same formulas of faith, but they retain them now with a private interpretation—with certain modifications and abatements which suffice to keep the judgment from absolute rebellion, and the churches from absolute disorganization. The theological student and the theological professor still amuse themselves by cracking, or attempting to crack, some very stale and hard theological nuts—the same being carefully preserved for that purpose in their "Standards"—

but they well know the nuts aforesaid are no longer popularly palatable or digestible. Sermons on the decrees of God are not in fashion. Discourses, on absolute and unconditional predestination and reprobation are not in demand. Whether a man can or can not fall from grace has ceased to be speculatively interesting. The churches have outgrown these things, and the very standards which contain them, and which were once so rigid and unyielding, have been forced by the people to become flexible—to receive an interpretation foreign to their language, or at least to bend without undue strain or resistance to the requirements of modern thought and modern feeling.

It is unfortunate that the real creed and the written one—that which is actually believed by the church and what is actually taught in its standards—should be so unlike and inconsistent; but how to remedy this without superinducing an ecclesiastical crash and catastrophe is a problem not easy of solution. The private members get on in the main comfortably enough as things are, many of them not knowing or even caring to know what their theologians have embodied as the sum and substance of sound doctrine and salutary metaphysics. But ever and anon a minister becomes recalcitrant, and that brings trouble. Of course he must be arraigned before the “courts,” and formally tried for heresy or insubordination, as the case may be. Being guilty, he must be convicted and excommunicated. But alas, it is discovered that in general his congregation sympathizes with him and stands by him; that he continues to preach and to teach, to marry the young and bury the dead, and to be in every way as respectable, as honorable, and as influential as he was before; while his independence and manliness in avowing and maintaining his honest convictions in the face of ecclesiastical authority, touch the cords of the popular heart and enhance his celebrity and distinction at the expense of his judges. A “penalty” fraught with such consequences is not much to be dreaded.

This is a bad state of things, viewed from the churches’ standpoint, but at present there seems to be no help for it. It might be thought that the easiest solution of the difficulty would be to modify the standards so as to conform them to the actual belief of those who at present only nominally accept them. But this is impracticable. In the first place, to suggest or propose such mod-

ification would amount to a humiliating concession on the part of the powers that be. They have been teaching all their life long that their standards are standards of truth. Certainly they may be interpreted with considerable freedom; the literal sense in which their fathers understood them may give place to some other one; the harder and harsher doctrines may be quietly ignored, or at any rate need not be emphasized; and the mind may take pleasant excursions into new fields and pastures green—always considering itself presumptively tethered to the old stakes. In other words, it is thought better to retain a show of fence around their premises although it cannot keep in their wild colts, nor keep out the roaring bulls of current heresy. Still the good, easy, fat kine will lie contentedly in the shade, chew their cuds in quiet meditation, and never think of testing the strength of their enclosure. Whereas, if the fence were once broken down, or the gate voluntarily thrown open, there is no telling the results to which it might lead. For once, concede that any given standard may be freely questioned, that old doctrines may be renounced and new ones embraced, and in many cases men would go to the extent of renouncing all human standards whatsoever! Nor does it follow by any means that all are agreed as to what they would accept, because they happen to concur in what they reject. And so at present there seems to be no remedy for the ecclesiastical disease that is giving the Doctors so much concern and trouble. How it will terminate it is impossible to say. We can only note the present symptoms, and express the conviction that the patient is getting on very well. That is to say, dropping the figure, we feel hopeful in view of the observed tendency of things ecclesiastic, that, as the struggle going on is one of life against forms, of the free and living present against the dead and rigid past, of light and love and liberty against the darkness, bigotry and tyranny of ages gone by, the right and true will ultimately triumph.

As might be supposed those churches whose doctrinal systems and ecclesiastical machinery are less discordant with the spirit of the age, and less far behind its light and knowledge, show correspondingly less marked advances and changes. But in none of them is ecclesiastical authority and mere clerical influence as potential and dreadful as formerly. The common school, the daily paper, the religious press, the general diffusion of knowledge, the

spirit of personal freedom which distinguishes the age—freedom to think and act in matters of religion for one's self, responsible only to God—all these constitute a force not easily resistible by any ecclesiasticism, not even the Roman Catholic. To the extent therefore that the various articles and formulae of the different denominations are really believed they are coming to be believed less and less on the authority of the church, and more and more upon the satisfying testimony of reason and Scripture, and this is encouraging. For, whenever a man is brought to accept a doctrine on the sole ground of what he conceives to be good and sufficient reasons, he is in a mental condition which will enable him to reject doctrines for want of such reasons. Thus creed and article and ordinance, custom, tradition and usage are coming to be more and more freely inquired into, discriminated and sifted; a process of elimination and accretion must result, and so little by little change and growth and progress will take place until men will gradually get out of the old rusts into a freer and better life, and a larger, freer and better system.

It seems therefore that the tendency of the better portion of Protestantism is in the direction of freedom from the dogmas and formulae of past generations, and of accepting directly from the Bible the faith and doctrine which it inculcates. The influences, however, which are calculated to retard this movement are numerous and powerful, so much so that it would be rash and visionary to anticipate a speedy arrival at this much to be desired goal. The fear of ecclesiastical discipline is by no means the only passion which needs to become quiescent in order to attain the end in view. There are others which, if manifesting less abjectness of soul, are quite as formidable antagonists of truth, and these are easily excited into action and maintained in fervor. Among these, not the feeblest nor the least friendly, is denominational pride, generated and fostered by long years of sectarian rivalry and strife. Men will suffer much, they will tolerate many a wrong and indignity, will shut their eyes to many a crudity of doctrine, and be silent respecting many a disapproved usage or practice, rather than consent by word or deed to lower in the smallest degree the standing of their church, or to give to its life-long rivals any advantage in argument or any concession of superiority. Then there is the pride of denominational numbers, of wealth, of social

standing, and of all the various elements of power and influence which it is able to wield, and this is an obstacle. In addition there is with many the absence of thought, owing to self-distrust, and the fond clinging to ancestral practices. Moreover, they themselves have paid their money to promote the interest of their church, they have made sacrifices for its welfare, they have labored long and earnestly for its success, and in prayers and tears and toils have identified themselves with it in weal and in woe, and it would require something like a sign from Heaven to convince them that anything else was better, or that in any other association they would be safer or happier, or could do more for the glory of God and the welfare of man. Some things, it is true, both in faith and doctrine, might perhaps be improved, but after all, many of the wise and good who have gone to Heaven before, went by this road, and so what need is there to leave it or to mend it? No doubt this spirit, which is bad only in its abuse, and which is carefully fostered by the ministry whose cause is felt to be otherwise weak, is one of the principal factors conservative of denominational institutions.

It will thus appear, without further specification, that the pride and vanity of some, the weakness and false logic of others, and the sectarian spirit of nearly all, are restraining influences sufficient to prevent any precipitancy in the movement of Protestantism, and calculated to perpetuate for an indefinite time the divided and inconsistent condition of the bodies which compose it.

The position of the Christian Church among these bodies is so essentially peculiar that it deserves special and separate treatment. They, as we have seen, under the influence of forces mainly *ab extra*, are slowly drifting away from dogmatic theology towards something simpler, more substantial and more Scriptural—a tendency which is retarded by their own opposition. They are struggling to avoid what the spirit of the age is gradually forcing them to accept. This church, on the other hand, is consciously, voluntarily and zealously pressing towards the very goal which the others, especially the leaders among them, would gladly avoid. It renounces all human authority in matters of religion. It accepts and it imposes no creed nor body of doctrine, resting upon such authority, as a bond of union or a condition of fellowship. It declares and maintains that the Bible, interpreted according to the

settled laws of language, is as readily intelligible as any substance of doctrine that men have assumed to deduce from it; and especially that in all that pertains to the salvation of the soul—what is to be believed and done in order to the beginning and development of the Christian life—its lessons are as remarkably simple as they are entirely sufficient. This church, consequently, is most truly Protestant; is indeed the only church that is seeking practically to realize and carry out the great original vitalizing principle of Protestantism—the authority and sufficiency of the Bible and the Bible alone in matters of faith and practice. Necessarily, therefore, the existence and influence of this powerful body must contribute largely to the acceleration of the general Protestant movement. Indeed, it can hardly be denied by any one at all familiar with the facts, that to it mainly is due the production of that tendency which at present characterizes religious society. If true to itself and its profession, it is destined to be recognized more and more fully and heartily as the Leader of Protestantism. Having stepped forth in advance and explored the ground; having practically tested the sufficiency and efficiency of the great Protestant principle, having carried it successfully through trials, and borne it bravely on through opposition and reproach, it must and it will be looked to as a most instructive and encouraging example to every reforming spirit that may hereafter arise.

This church is singular in its constituency, being composed of members gathered largely from all the Protestant sects as well as from the world—coming together with their individual prepossessions and prejudices, to accept and carry out the one great fundamental principle—it is no wonder that as a whole the body is more or less heterogeneous. This fact is at once an element of weakness and of strength; of the latter because it shows the position to be catholic in spirit and universal in its adaptations; and of the former because it has introduced into the body elements so grotesquely incongruous with its spirit, while stickling for its letter, as to bring unmerited reproach and obloquy upon the whole. In charity we must regard them all as “children of Abraham,” but while the great leading, shaping, influential, characterizing mass are “Israelites indeed,” there are some, alas, who are veritable *Ishmaelites*. Now and then these find their way into the pulpit; occasionally they get control of a press; and from one or both of

these eminences they deal out religious thunder and lightning without stint or reserve. Woe to the sects without ! Woe to common sense within ! Woe to missions, home and foreign ! Woe to everything that could give the cause success ! They are so noisy, blustering and dogmatic that it is not surprising to find the world and the churches aroused, mistaking them for representative men, and supposing that the great body of the church is made up of the same emptiness, vanity and pretension. But not so. These are but spots and blemishes. The true church has some adequate appreciation of the difficulties besetting the feet of a man brought up in the bosom of a party, and is disposed, not to assail him with rude shafts, but lovingly to help him along while patiently bearing with his slowness. The true church does not think that sanctified common sense tends to popery, nor that the only expedient which is sound is one that is impracticable or inefficient. It is for liberality, for charity, for the *best* way of sending the gospel to the destitute, for the *best* means of bringing the world, at home and abroad, under the influence of the truth, and for the spirit, the attitude and bearing towards the religious parties around, that will be most likely to propitiate them to its lofty position, and help them to occupy it.

But take it as it is—with all its good elements and its bad, with its strength and its weakness ; its successes and its failures—and we will not say that it is to be the church of the future ; it is the church of the present—standing far ahead of any in the grandeur of its aims, the catholicity of its spirit, the strength of its position, the consistency of its plea, and the divinity of its authority. It is the church of Christian Union, and its relation to other churches is not unlike that of the American Union to the governments of the old world.

Thus the Christian Church had to run the guantlet of ridicule and sarcasm. The *Christian Church*, for sooth ! It was misunderstood, misrepresented, slighted, contemned, caricatured ; but in spite of it all the lovers of God and of religious freedom, kept pouring into it, enriching it by their contributions, and strengthening it by their talents and influence, until now it is recognized as a great power in the land. Let us hope that it will use its power wisely and well ; that it will appreciate its mission alike to Protestantism and to the world ; that it will cultivate more and more the

blessed spirit of the gospel; that it will diffuse around itself the light and love it has received from above—attracting, wooing, winning men from the slavery of sin and from the beggarly elements of fossilized dogmatism to the glorious life and liberty of the original gospel. Thus will it serve the present age; thus be true to its sacred mission; and thus continue to strengthen and encourage the upward tendency of Protestantism, “until we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.”

J. S. LAMAR.

AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.

THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, for January and April, is on our table. In examining and comparing all our American Quarterly Reviews, I selected this magazine as the *model* for our own as to form and mechanical execution. The April No. favors us with a very flattering notice, which we fully appreciate. We are grateful for the notice as assisting us to a favorable introduction to the society of Quarterly Reviews. It already is one of the goodly company and we can not introduce it; but we can pay it the higher compliment of recognizing it as worthy of a *review*, and review it accordingly. If I agreed with all of its positions I would not publish this magazine, and I would be a Cumberland Presbyterian; but as I look at Bible questions from a different standpoint, of course I differ from it. I trust that whenever I do, it will be in the spirit of Christian liberality and fairness.

In the January No. there is an article entitled *The Presbyterianism of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, which contains some expressions from which a useful lesson may be drawn. The April No. contains a similar article under the caption, *What is Presbyterianism? Does it exist Jure Divino?* What we may say about the former applies as well to the latter.

The aim of the writer of the January article is to prove that the Cumberland Presbyterian church is as much *the Presbyterian church* as any other Presbyterian church. When we get to writing about *Churches* in the plural, our thoughts become somewhat mixed. He seems to have no concern as to whether the "Cumberland Presbyterian church" is the "Church of Christ," but the extent of his desire, appear to be, to be as sound as *the* "Presbyterian Church." He claims that as the form of church government gave the name, their form of government being the same, therefore they are entitled to the name. I think the claim is in-

disputable, and why they prefixed an adjective to the name to which they had such good claim, I cannot imagine ; it appears to me to have been a fatal blunder, as in doing so they gave up their claim to the name ; just as *the* Presbyterian church did, when it was first organized, gave up the name "Christian" or "Church of Christ" and adopted another modifying name, thereby admitting that their organization means something different to the "Church of Christ," "Presbyterian Church of Christ" must signify something different to "Church of Christ," or the name would not have been changed. They cannot object to any other religious people taking the name "Church of Christ" or "Christian Church" because they deliberately waived all claim to it. They named themselves "The Presbyterian Church" and no one has a right to use it without their permission ; and while "The Cumberland Presbyterian Church" may have had at one time a legal right to the name, they waived that right and it is too late now to claim it ; they can only regain it by the consent of the older organization. Although this is the claim of the essay, the real point is that the *Presbyterianism* of the one is the same as the *Presbyterianism* of the other. I think this is so, but whether it is or not does not concern me, what I wish to call attention to is that the *Presbyterianism* of neither of them is the *Presbyterianism* of the Bible. It seems to me, if I were a Cumberland Presbyterian, I would not care whether my theory and practice of church government tallied with some one's else, but my concern would be to know whether it was the Bible plan. I have just said that I did not believe that the Presbyterianism of either was the Presbyterianism of the Bible. Let us see what Presbyterian Presbyterianism is :

"Presbyters in the Presbyterian Church of to-day, are officers who have been chosen or elected and ordained to the ecclesiastical and spiritual government of the Church. These Presbyters are of two orders, to-wit, the preaching and the lay, who differ in their office, election, ordination and work. The preaching presbyters are called of God, and on due trial, elected to their office by the voice of the Presbytery. The lay presbyters are called or chosen and elected by the voice of the congregation, and are ordained by the pastor in charge of the church."

Now from the first verse of Matthew to the last of Revelation not one word is said about two classes of presbyters, lay and preaching ; not one word said about two kinds of ordination, or of two different elections. Nothing said about any of them being

elected by the "Presbytery." Am I not warranted in saying that Presbyterian presbyterianism was not the presbyterianism of the Bible?

But I am regarding a certain question as of importance that is not so regarded by the writer, for he says :

"Presbyterianism is not a standard or system of doctrines, neither is it to be measured by theological tape or weighed in theological scales. It is strictly a governmental term, having no relation to theology save by association."

If it is not to be measured by theological tape or weighed in theological scales, I suppose it makes no difference what the Bible teaches on the subject.

"Presbyterianism is not Calvinism and Calvinism is not Presbyterianism;" then what is it? If it is not to be measured by the theological tape, by what standard must it be measured?

"As to systems of theology, Cumberland Presbyterians are both Calvinistic and Arminianistic in doctrine; repudiating in the former those extreme fatalistic doctrines taught in the 'Westminster Confession of Faith,' and rejecting in the latter those doctrines seemingly indicating human merit and the insecurity of the saints."

It would seem from these extracts that the Cumberland Presbyterians do not measure their church government and organization by theological tape, but taking two human theories of God and his relations to man select from the two those items that they prefer on this selection form a sect to further divide and bewilder people who wish to serve God.

"If we may be tried by the pulpit of the Presbyterian Church of to-day, or by the 'New School men,' we are Presbyterians. Their preaching certainly chimes in with our Confession of Faith, much better than it does with their own. * * * We would find less difficulty in reconciling their sermons with our Confession of Faith, than with their own."

In all these extracts, and in the entire essay, the New Testament is not once appealed to as the standard by which to determine the correctness of name, church organization and government, or doctrine. It seems to me to be much more reasonable and proper to go to the New Testament than to men for organization, discipline, name and doctrine. This may appear to savor too much of old fogysm to suit Doctors of Divinity and Professors of Theology, as in that blessed Book neither class is mentioned; but as I am neither the one nor the other, I cling to The Book.

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, for January, contains a lengthy

and matured article by Bishop Littlejohn, the subject being, *Christian Dogma Essential*, (1) *To Christian Teaching*, (2) *To Christian Life*, (3) *To the Being and Work of the Christian Church*.

On account of the relation that the author sustains to the Episcopal church and the importance of the subject, we propose to notice it at some length.

He defines "dogma" thus; "Generally speaking, a dogma is a positive truth enjoined by authority. Christian dogma is truth revealed and certified by divine, and therefore, infallible authority." We cannot agree to this definition. Generally speaking, a dogma is *not* a positive truth, very generally it is not a truth at all. It is correct to say that a dogma is a proposition decreed by human authority. God did not decree or publish dogmas, he taught a doctrine. But he is speaking of doctrinal notions established by a body of men and hence he correctly uses the term "dogma," and his title should be "Opinions of the doctrine of Christ formulated by an organized assembly of professed Christians essential," etc. This title correctly represents the argument of his thesis, and adopting it, we proceed with our review. He says many excellent things, things that I wish could be spoken from every pulpit in the world. As an example, I quote:

"In these days the reality of Divine knowledge, *i. e.*, of revealed truth, is set aside by one or by both of two expedients—by affirming that nothing is or can be known for certain about the being of God, the origin of the world, the destiny of man; or by resolving what religion offers to or requires from us into a matter of individual opinion or sentiment admitting of indefinite variations both in substance and form, and to be accounted as truly peculiarities, idiosyncracies, accidents of the individual, as the hue of his skin or the height of his stature. This generation has been helped to this latter expedient by a good deal of the Protestant thinking and teaching during the past century. Said Cardinal Newman more than thirty years ago, 'The old Catholic notion which still lingers in the Established Church, was, that Faith was an intellectual act, its object truth, and its result knowledge. Thus if you look into the Anglican Prayer Book, you will find definite *credenda*, as well as definite *agenda*: but in proportion as the Lutheran leaven spread, it became fashionable to say that Faith was, not an acceptance of revealed doctrine, not an act of the intellect, but a feeling, an emotion, an affection, an appetency; and as this view of Faith obtained, so was the connection of Faith with Truth and knowledge more and more either forgotten or denied: until men came to believe and to take it for granted that Religion was nothing beyond a *supply* of the wants of human nature, not an external fact and a work of God: *i. e.*, that its essence was to be found not in what God *says*, but in what man *feels*.'"

In answering the objections that he supposes might be made to his position he says that one class of men would say :

"Follow Christ, accept Him, and you have the only basis of unity that is broad enough for all; you have the only theology, the only dogma which this age will endure. Follow Christ! but what Christ? a human or a divine Christ? a Christ who gave Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world—the very lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world? or a Christ who taught by example how every man can be his own savior? the Christ of the Nicene Creed, or the Christ of Arius? the Christ of the Holy Catholic Church to-day, or the Christ of Theodore Parker, of Gregg and Strauss. If Christ is to be followed, Christ must be taught; if He is to be taught, there must be a doctrine of Christ to teach—a Christology, and if a Christology, then, of necessity, a Theology, and if a Theology, then truth formulated into dogma."

This is excellent up to the conclusion, and if it were a logical conclusion we would be compelled to accept it; but his conclusion does not follow, and not being legitimate we are not bound to accept, if it be not the truth. If the following of Christ necessitated the teaching of Christ, and if the teaching of Christ required a doctrine of Christ, and if the doctrine required a dogma, which means a proposition decreed by human authority, then how was it that men on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem became followers of Christ. There was no dogma there from the very nature of the case, since the apostles had agreed upon nothing and could not, because they were not up to that time "endued with power from on high." Their becoming christians followed their being taught of Christ, and their being taught of Christ was accomplished by Peter telling them of the life, workings, teachings, death, resurrection and promises of Christ, and he did this without any formulated opinions of men.

The trouble in his argument is in saying "there must be a doctrine of Christ"; the wrong preposition is used; *of* should be *from*, and then we would change the proposition thus: If Christ is to be followed, Christ must be taught, and if taught he must be taught in his life and in his commands and promises. He may insist that the difficulty occurs in deciding what he did command, and that it required a dogma to decide. To this objection we enter our former answer, that men were taught successfully before ever a dogma was decreed, and that no dogma was decreed during the lifetime of the apostles. Dogmas were not promulgated until men began to change the commands of Christ on the ground of

expediency, and when the right to change was admitted then human opinions came into conflict, divisions occurred, and *ex necessitate rei*, men were forced to meet, organize, agree and decree what they would teach in order to make men follow Christ according to their way of thinking; and thus the *demand* for dogmas brought the *supply*, and the supply brought an increased demand; for there never yet has been a dogma that did not cause another dogma.

"In fact, the only reasonable, practical, effective loyalty to Christ, is loyalty to the Church's witness to Christ, and therefore loyalty to the Church's dogmas concerning Christ."

What Church? When did the Church ever decree a dogma? These two questions must be answered before we can admit the correctness of the above statement. Doubtless he will answer the first question, "Episcopal"; but we could not accept that because we can find no such church mentioned in the Bible. He might modify his answer to, "the Apostolic Catholic Church"; but this is open to the same objection. That he has reference to the Episcopal church when he speaks of *the Church*, is evident when he says: "The recent secession from the Church of England of Rev. Stopford Brooke. * * * Therefore, with commendable honesty, Mr. Brooke abandons the Church and strikes out into a wider orbit than could be found within her limits."

The second question, When did the Church decree a dogma? he would probably answer by referring to all the Convocations of the Episcopal Church, but as we deny that the Episcopal church is *the Church*, not being named or described in the New Testament, of course we could not admit that loyalty to any such dogmas was loyalty to Christ. An organization of men having officers different to the officers of the church established by Christ cannot be by his authority. Christ or his apostles never established the offices of Dean, Canon, Priest, Archbishop, or the titles of Rev., Right Rev., or Doctor of Divinity, and yet the writer claims to be Right Reverend and a Doctor of Divinity, and that the church that has authorized him to wear these titles is the church. Loyalty to such dogmas is not loyalty to Christ. As it is unreasonable for me to assent to this statement, I will submit a proposition for his consideration: "*In fact, the only reasonable, practical, effective loyalty to Christ, is loyalty to his commands and the commands of his in-*

spired ambassadors." Can there be any objection to that; if not, will he accept it, and if he accepts it as true, will he conform his preaching and his practice to it?

"Now it is the characteristic superiority of Christianity that its foundations are laid in a sure and definite knowledge of the objects with which it deals. It starts with clear statements of the origin of the world, of the creation, the fall, and the destiny of man. It sets forth fully and comprehensively the being, the attributes, the government of God, and describes with care and minuteness, which leave nothing to be desired, every instrument and purpose of the scheme of grace."

We would infer from this that he uses the term "Christianity" as the system of religion given by Christ, and that He gave it with such care and minuteness in connection with the scheme of grace, that nothing more was needed. This I do verily believe; *he does not*, for he says:

"The very variety of dress and outward circumstances presents the truths of Scripture in so many aspects and at so many angles that, when individual minds deal with them, they always leave some parts in the shadow and fall short of a harmonious and complete interpretation. To secure such a rendering, the collective and continuous minds of the Church must intervene. The Word of God to reach us in the fulness of its power, free alike from defect and excess, must reach us through a medium as large, as pure, as divine as itself—even the very Body of Christ."

In the one extract he tells us that Christianity is so carefully and minutely set forth in every instrument and purpose of the scheme of grace, as to leave nothing to be desired, and in the next, that its dress and outward circumstances are such that individual minds cannot fully comprehend it, and that it can only be fully set forth by the church. It seems that individuals did comprehend it well enough to be saved by it before it was set forth in any dogma by any society of men.

"It may be asked can it (the church) not teach the Written Word of God? Is it not forbidden to teach anything not contained in that Word, or that may not be proved thereby? Are not its purity and fidelity to be gauged by the strictness with which it adheres to that word? Has it any other character than it finds in the Word?"

These I consider very pertinent questions and am of those who think the asking is the answer. He thinks differently, thus:

"This is not the whole of the case, not the whole of the truth. Every principle, every truth we require to know for the soul's health is there; but they must be gathered ordinarily from many particulars. They are seldom rounded out in any one state-

ment," therefore, he argues, a convocation, a council or a synod must formulate the truth before it can be presented to the world. Church history shows us that convocations, councils and synods "round out" the principles and truths contained in the Bible so completely that they lose all connection with the Bible. But then, as a matter of fact, this "rounding out" of the truths of the Bible is not necessary to its understanding. The plan of salvation and the duty of a Christian can be understood without the assistance of council, convocation or synod; if they could not be, then Christ's effort to build his church or to establish his kingdom was a failure. I do not suppose that any one would plainly assert that any man or set of men have been inspired since the apostles; if they have not, their collective wisdom is liable to error, and any dogma that they may have published has in it the element of human fallibility, and no matter how small that element may be, it is sufficient to affect its credibility. When we go to the Bible statement we *know* that it has no fallible element in it, and we *know* that if we do what it says we cannot be wrong.

What "principle or truth that we require to know for the soul's health" requires to be "rounded out" in order to be taught or understood? Is it what a man shall preach? If it is, turn to Matt. 28:19-20. "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." Does this require any rounding out? If it does turn to Mark 16:15-16. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." Does the "baptizing" need a dogma to make the ordinary mind understand it? Was there any trouble about it until councils took it in hand to dogmatize about it? Read the following extract from one of the brightest minds in the Episcopal Church, Dean Stanley, and learn what an improvement (?) a dogma is over the plain statement of the Bible.

"For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize'—that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water"; and

yet the dogma of the Episcopal Church is that sprinkling may be substituted for it.

Let us go back to his definition of dogma. "Christian dogma is truth revealed and certified by divine, and, therefore, infallible authority." Was sprinkling for, instead of, immersion revealed and certified by divine authority? Mosheim, Neander, Schaff, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Barnes, Conybeare, Howson, Lange, Far-
rar, Stanley, and others almost innumerable, certify that the divine revelation and certificate was *immersion*, not *sprinkling*.

Thus we might go on with every one of the "thirty-nine articles" and show that they either failed to make the point any plainer or that the proposition contained in the articles was a perversion of the teaching of the Bible; but we have not space to go more into detail.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE, for January contains an article by Rufus Ellis, D. D.: *The Apostle Paul; His Jewish Theology and his Christian Religion*, that claims a short notice. He opens with the very true statement that "The temptation to make the prophet and evangelist plead for our opinions is very hard to be resisted," and we are not sure that he has successfully resisted the temptation. There is much in the article that is objectionable, but it is so constructed that it is very difficult to catch exactly the leading thought so as to present it clearly in a short notice. We think we are correct in saying that he is trying to show that Paul believed in predestination, that he had a direct assurance that he was one of the elect, and that he taught that every man should strive to be holy whether he was elected or not; that he preached holy living first and then Calvinism. I make several extracts in support of this summary.

"And let me say first that the teaching of the apostle, so far as it relates to the ways of God with man, is ruled and pervaded by an extreme and unqualified determinism, even a doctrine of decrees which exalts a sovereign will above a sovereign goodness. In this, Paul was a Calvinist before Calvin. His doctrine is that of unconditional predestination, supralapsarian for aught that I can discover to the contrary."

"But in some wondrous way it comes home to him against all his prejudices that the life which he needs and has hardly dared to long for has been granted by Him who turns the hearts of men as the rivers of water are turned."

"What Westminster puts first, however, feebly held by him, he would have put last. And so I set down as the chief characteristic of Paul, as the reality in him which was sure to make him a Christian apostle, not his doctrine of the decrees which has been made so conspicuous in the catechism, nor yet his doctrine of inability, which, although it seems to me utterly and absolutely true, is only our common human experience and by itself only disheartening,—not these, but his imperative craving for a real righteousness."

These extracts, we think, show that our conception or summary of his essay is correct; then let us see if his positions are correct:

1. "His (Paul's) doctrine is that of unconditional predestination." Paul says: "For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man, for neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." From this we see that Paul had no doctrine except what he received by inspiration, and if he were a Calvinist, then Christ was a Calvinist before Calvin. Can we learn from the Bible what Christ did teach on this subject? "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." If Paul said that what he taught was by inspiration, and if Christ made salvation free to every one who would accept, then when Paul said, "whom he foreordained, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified," he could not mean that God had decreed from all eternity some *could not* believe and therefore not be saved. In scripture, as in everything else, we must interpret the doubtful by the certain. We know that the Bible does not contradict itself in any of its writers, and if there should be any apparent contradiction we know that it is only apparent. It would not be very difficult, in the light of recent study to satisfactorily interpret this last quoted utterance of Paul with the teaching of Christ, but as this is not the occasion to enter into such a discussion, we leave it by repeating the declaration that Paul spoke by inspiration and that the Spirit taught the very opposite of predestination.

In advocating the doctrine of predestination the writer recognizes the objection that is made against it, that if a man believed his destiny was fixed from the beginning that he could not be aroused to any effort to elevate his moral nature, and that a feeling of perfect indifference would possess him as to his future life. He

answers this objection by citing the lives of devoted Christian men who underwent trials and hardships to preach to and convert their fellow men, who were Calvinists. Our explanations of those lives is that they did not believe in the doctrine of divine decrees. A man may subscribe to a creed without believing, it is being done every day. It is not natural for a man to contradict his belief by his actions.

THE UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, for January, has several interesting articles. The first article is *The Demonology of Jesus*. The writer states the three opinions held on the subject: 1. Jesus did believe that demons existed. 2. Jesus did not believe that demons existed, but accommodated his language to the popular belief, not caring to enter into a discussion of the matter. 3. Jesus believed that demons existed, as did the people at that time, but he and the people were both mistaken. The first is the generally received opinion of the religious world; the second is the opinion of Unitarians and Universalists; and the third is the rationalistic theory. The writer objects to all. He says:

"To the first we must raise the objection that it is too entirely detached from and opposed to our modern philosophy of life, and our real practical faith. The hypothesis is seriously damaged by our scientific knowledge of disease. We are no longer under the necessity of attributing insanity or epilepsy to demoniacal possession, for we know something of the physical conditions which cause them. We have no difficulty in classing demonomania as a branch of human pathology, a diseased state arising from morbid causes which can be ascertained and accounted for without any consideration of supernatural or demoniacal agency." "Our objection to the second hypothesis is that it cannot be stated without implying conscious and deliberate deception on the part of Jesus; that such deception was, at least in many cases, obviously unnecessary and always inconsistent with his character."

As to the third theory: "We cannot be satisfied with this theory. A man deluded by the education, carried away by the superstitions of his country and his age is not the Jesus of the four gospels; not the grand, historic personage whose life is wrought into all that is highest and best in our modern civilization, its creative impulse and its vivifying spirit."

"We believe the true solution of the problem to be the recognition of the extent to which a prevalent system of thought, a mode of speech universal within its limits, a conception to which one has been accustomed from his youth, may impress the mind, color the very thought, and haunt the consciousness of a man, without subverting him. We do not accept the philoso-

phy of Plato; we know very well that the affections are not the products of cardiac activity; that the heart is not the seat of the emotions; yet we find this Platonic conception not only furnishing us a convenient form of speech, but presenting itself to our thought, so that there is no conscious accommodation in our language in speaking of a large hearted man."

We agree with the author in rejecting the *second* and *third* theories; we do not agree with him in his opinion; we hold to the *first*, that "Jesus did believe in the existence of demons." It will not do to compare our forms of speech accommodated to exploded ideas, to the utterances of Jesus on this subject. We may say: "My heart is breaking with grief," without intending to do more than to use a figure, but when Jesus speaks to his disciples about an evil spirit being of a *certain particular* class, then he was not speaking figuratively or in a form of accommodation. When he forced the demons to go out of the men and permitted them to go into the swine, he was not speaking according to a habit ingrained by constant familiarity; he was not only speaking, but he was *doing*. A man cannot *do* figuratively. When he performed this miracle he either knew that there were demons in those men, or he wilfully deceived the people, and by some legerdemain caused the swine to run into the sea. Just what those demons were, the laws which governed them, or where they now are, are questions we cannot answer. As long as we believe in the divinity of Christ, we expect to believe in the actuality of demons at that time.

Another article of some interest is *The Eschatology of St. Paul*. It is well written and ingeniously argued, but we call attention to it especially as an occasion to say what we have had on our mind to say for some time, namely, that we deprecate the prevalence of the custom of trying to explain away the plain meaning of the Scriptures by conjectures.

This article gives us an opportunity to illustrate. The Bible says: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "And these shall go way into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." These Scriptures do not suit the Universalist because they teach exactly the opposite of his teaching, and hence he must go to work to find some other meaning than that which is so palpable. That is what the writer is trying to do in this article. His plan is this: He assumes with some plausibility that the twelve apostles did not,

even after the ascension of Jesus, understand that his kingdom was spiritual, but were expecting him hourly to return and take his position as an earthly king. They did not realize that the Mosaic laws were abrogated and the Temple worship superceeded; and when Paul came preaching the universality of the offer of pardon, to the Gentile as well as the Jew, then arose a sharp strife between the two factions,

"And in the end an almost open warfare which sent Jewish-Christian spies from Jerusalem to track St. Paul upon his way, as if he had been a traitor to the common cause. Naturally there must have been some bond of union, however slight, that kept primitive christianity from parting clear asunder in utter wreck. And what was this common bond? The common bond was a common error, a delusion shared by all parties and attended with the most disastrous results. The earliest apostolic christianity, it is said, consisted mainly in the faith in Christ's coming again, to-day, or to-morrow, or the third day. It was an objective advent attended by the conflagration of the world, the winding up of all human affairs, and the general judgment of mankind. For the approach of these dread events the early christians were looking from day to day, almost from hour to hour. Thereby their whole life was infected with a morbid tendency: they became idle, improvident, contemptuous of the stern duties of every-day life. Even the written morality of the New Testament is under the influence of this fatal infection. We readily concede to the rationalizing critics—what it is mere foolishness to deny—that St. Paul shared with all the early christians a common delusion in regard to the speedy return of Christ in person to the earth. As we follow the development of the Pauline doctrine from the date of the earliest to the latest epistles, we shall find these merely human opinions, receding more and more into the background, until they are wholly lost sight of in the increasing radiance of those great truths which it is the plain intent of the inspired pages to reveal.

The idea being this: that the Bible was written by men who had their peculiar views concerning the character and mission of Christ, who in writing strove to present their opinions but were continually prevented by the divine power from so doing, but not so completely but that their convictions tinged their written testimonies; and that although the apostle Paul fully realized his mission to be to preach a universal gospel, yet his early national Jewish education caused him in his earlier ministry to say things that he did not repeat in his later epistles, and thus by this theory they are enabled to set aside any declaration of the Bible that does not suit them as being the utterance of human prejudice, and receive that which does suit them as being the utterance of the Holy Spirit. It is a strange theory that if a teacher in his first lesson

states a proposition as a fact and in subsequent lessons states other facts (not contradictory of the first) and fails to repeat the fact of the first lesson, that therefore he has changed his mind and no longer holds the statements of the first lessons true; but this is precisely what this writer is doing. He dismisses all that Paul says that does not suit him as being the result of race prejudice and early training, and finds nothing that is inspired until he discovers something that may be strained into a support of his position. The best that he can find is 1. Cor. 15, in which he pronounces that Paul is fully emancipated from his human prejudices and opinions, the very opening verses of which are as fatal to his theory as any declaration in the Bible.

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you; which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you." Here is a positive endorsement of what he had preached. No taking back anything whatever. No indication of any change of views. "By which also ye are saved, *if* ye keep in memory what I preached." Suppose they did not keep in memory what he preached, would they be saved? If they would be saved under either condition, either keeping it in memory or forgetting it, what was the use of his preaching?

But if Christ himself said that the righteous should go into life eternal and the wicked into everlasting punishment, what does it matter what may be the eschatology of the apostle Paul? If his eschatology is different from the eschatology of Christ, then Paul is wrong; but believing in the Inspiration of the Bible, taking either of the three views of inspiration you choose, we know that Paul does not contradict Christ, and if any utterance of his should apparently do so, we *know* that it is only apparent, not real. My faith in the inspiration of the Bible is of that kind that when I find a plain statement of a fact I accept it, and when I find another I accept that, and so on to the end, and if I find any declarations, that seem to conflict, I try to understand them so that the conflict disappears. With this faithful belief in the Bible I have no need to resort to a laborious search for a hidden meaning. If all men would take the Bible, and *do* its plain commands as they find them, there would be no sects, and there would break upon the world a power of holiness unthought of now.

Another article, *The sin against the Holy Ghost*, the longest article in this No., is by T. J. Sawyer, D. D., Dean of Tufts Divinity School. We notice it because there is always an interest attaching to the subject. The author analyzes the subject, dividing it into three parts, and discusses each part separately:

"1. In what sense are we to understand *the Holy Ghost* here spoken of as the subject of this blasphemy? 2. How shall we interpret the declaration that this blasphemy *shall not be forgiven*? 3. What is the meaning of the words, *Neither in this world nor in the world to come*?"

His answer to the first question is, that *Holy Ghost* here does not mean the personality, or as usually expressed, *the third person of the Trinity*, but the *Spirit of God*. The argument is, that if it means the former, he cannot understand why blaspheming against it should be more heinous than against the Father or the Son; and also that in the passage of Scripture under consideration (Matt. 12:31-32) in the 31st verse the word "Spirit" is used without the "Holy," and in the 32d verse the words "Holy Spirit" are used, the terms are used as equivalents, and hence no special meaning is intended by the term "Holy." Mark 3:28-29, records it so as to use the word Spirit only once and then coupled with the word "Holy." Luke also records it so as to use the term once only and then "Holy Spirit." From this we see that although his conclusions may be correct, his deduction is not logical, for the weight of presumption would be in favor of the position that the "Spirit" of the 31st verse was defined by the "Holy Spirit" of the 32d verse. We cannot see how the decision either way would have any bearing on the question.

The second question is answered by saying that the declaration, "shall not be forgiven" is figurative. The argument is: That as the declaration "all sins shall be forgiven" has to be taken in a modified sense, that is, that no one believes that sins will be forgiven unconditionally, and as this passage says nothing about conditions, we are compelled to take it with limitations, therefore, if we take one member of the sentence with limitations, the other must be taken in the same way. Here is another example of the mischievous habit of not taking *all* that the Bible says as constituting a perfect whole, instead of taking one declaration and bending and twisting and perverting everything into harmony with it. In other places in the Bible we are told that

forgiveness is conditioned on certain things and when we are told anywhere else that a man's sins are forgiven or will be forgiven we *know* that the conditions are understood, and hence this language can be taken literally. His argument, however, is that it must be taken in a limited sense and therefore also must the other declaration, and doing that it is legitimate to say that it would require *the deepest repentance* to obtain forgiveness of this sin; or to paraphrase this Scripture: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men upon a repentance proportionate to the sin; but the blasphemy against the Spirit being a very grave sin it shall only be forgiven unto men upon the deepest repentance." Does not the author, the Dean of a "Divinity School," know what *repentance* means? Does he have so limited a conception of "repentance" that he thinks it is measured by the sin? Repentance does not depend on degrees for its efficacy.

The third question, "What is the meaning of the words: *'Neither in this world, nor in the world to come?'*" is answered by saying that "world" means "dispensation," and that it should read, "neither in the Jewish dispensation or in the Christian dispensation." Admitting this, nothing is answered, for the general belief is that unless a man obtains forgiveness of sins in this life he never will. No other idea can attach to the declaration than that the sin is never to be pardoned. Take Luke's version and there can be no misapprehension.

In the April No. of the QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH, in the article, "The First Duty of the Church," by D. C. Kelley, D.D., we find an interesting exegesis of 2 Cor. 10:15. "Not boasting of things without *our* measure, that is, of other men's labours; but having hope when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, to preach the gospel in the *regions* beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand."

Dr. Kelley says: "This passage has been so full of perplexity as to provoke a different rendering from each exegete. Adam Clarke renders *κavóna*, the Greek word for rule, or law, in the sense of *district*. He says, 'He appears to think that every apostle

has a particular *district*, or *province*, of the heathen world allotted to him.' Macknight translates *ναρόνα*, *line*, and explains accordingly. Lange explains, *measuring-line*, in the sense of limit. Conybeare and Howson, within the *limits* appointed one. New Version, 'To be magnified in you according to our *province*'—evidently in the sense of prerogative. We only give these conflicting and perplexing renditions to bring out clearly the fact that the key has not been in the hands of these laborers, else we had found agreement. The word *ναρόνα*, over which they stumble, and on account of which all this confusion arises, expresses a *rule*, in the sense of a binding law, as no other Greek word expresses it. The natural meaning is that assigned it by our translators. The difficulty was not the meaning of the word—this was plain enough; the trouble lay in the fact that if the declaration was taken in its simplest and plainest form, it announces a custom or law which these exegetes did not think existed, viz., a requirement upon the part of the apostle that all the churches should make contributions to aid him in carrying the gospel into the regions beyond. As they have hesitated and been perplexed over *ναρόνα*, so they all stumble over the word translated *enlarged* in our version—many of them making the apostle to seek honor or praise at the hands of the churches, as if in sentimental mood he had begged for sympathy. What a contradictory picture this would be!

"Let us turn from this confusion to inspiration as its own interpreter: Προπέμπω has been regarded as indicating a habit on the part of the churches of accompanying the apostles a short distance on their journeyings; but this was properly regarded by our commentators as too insignificant a matter to be dignified into mention as an apostolic *rule*. We propose to show that the delicately technical sense which this word acquired was a contribution of aid toward the journey."

The writer then refers to and quotes Acts 15:3; Rom. 15:24; 1 Cor. 16:6; 1 Cor. 16:11; 2 Cor. 1:16, and Titus 3:13, showing plainly that in each place the idea is rendering *assistance* by which the journey could be accomplished, and not mere personal companionship. He says: "In the New Version of 3 John 5:8, we have, 'Beloved, thou doest a faithful work in whatsoever thou doest toward them that are brethren and strangers withal; who bare witness to the love before the Church; whom thou wilt do

well to set forward on their journey worthily of God; because that for the sake of the Name they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles. We therefore ought to welcome such, that we may be fellow-workers with the truth.'

"John here explains the meaning of the term used with the precision of a lexicographer. For Jesus' sake they had gone forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles. If we help them, we become *fellow-workers*. The blessing of *fellow-workers* is the apostolic end in all these delicate admonitions. Had he commanded, the churches might have obeyed, but at the loss of the 'abounding grace' ceased to be the 'cheerful giver.' These gifts were both *fruits* of love, and *seed* which, in its germination and growth, enriched the sower, brought blessing to the receiver, and from both thanksgivings to God. So high was this grace in apostolic esteem that he dealt with it in the most delicate possible way, that it might have loving volition as its origin, that perfunctoriness and hypocrisy should thus forever be shut out of its holy penetralia.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, Cincinnati, Ohio, for April, contains several very interesting articles, and from one, "The Divorce of Spirituality and Integrity," we desire to give our readers several extracts. It is written by C. B. Crane, D. D., Boston:

"There is a so-called spirituality which belongs rather to the realm of taste and art than to the realm of religion. In music, in architecture, in painting, in poetry, in eloquence, in manners, in whatever is essentially beautiful or sublime, there is a mysterious power to exalt the sensibilities and quicken the aspirations of all fine and sensitive natures. The emotions thus produced is essentially an aesthetic, and not at all a religious, emotion. But if it be produced in the name of religion, and in the midst of religious associations, it will easily be mistaken for a religious emotion. The breathing of the organ, the stateliness and exquisite proportions of the sanctuary, the surpassing beauty of the liturgy, the chasteness of the pulpit oratory, the majesty of the choral song, the refined faces and manners of the worshipers, all conspire to produce an emotional or sentimental exaltation. The subject of this delightful experience, not apprehending its aesthetic nature, christens its spirituality. It is very elegant, but it must be spirituality

And then, in order to the maintenance of so eloquent a spirituality, the original conditions of it must always be observed. And so there comes about a somewhat select and seclusive type of religion, a type suggestive of the boudoir and of rose-water and of graceful conventionalities. It is almost believed that the only unpardonable sin is a sin against good taste. But publicans and sinners have not good taste and would be certain to commit the unpardonable sin. Why then have dealings with the publicans and sinners? Why not have parlor conferences of religion after the manner of the old Paris salons? So, our aesthetic spirituality is well content to stand aside, and let hard-handed and grimy sinners stagger forward unhelped to perdition. Ah, if integrity be, as I shrewdly suspect it is, man's love for man, then we have here a so-called spirituality which is divorced from integrity.

There is a so-called spirituality of another sort. It is the spirituality of sentiment. It has much to say about spiritual preaching and spiritual things. It criticises and condemns preachers who, instead of preaching alway the so-called high spiritualities of Christian doctrine, prefer to get down into the ditch where sinners are sleeping or struggling, and by all sorts of arguments and warnings and persuasions strive to get them out of the ditch. There are many styles of spiritual preaching. There is a spiritual preaching for ripe saints, and a spiritual preaching for unripe saints; a spiritual preaching for confirmed sinners, and a spiritual preaching for unconfirmed sinners.

For illustrations of another type of defective spirituality, let us go both into the pulpit and into the pew. There are ministers who preach seraphically, and are evidently sincere while they are preaching. But their wives say to themselves, "they are very hard to live with." And you discover by and by that they are not exactly honest either intellectually or financially, that they contract debts without having the means to pay them, and that they are as accomplished jugglers as Mephistopheles himself. They are ministers of whom you say, "once in the pulpit, they ought never to go out; and once out, they ought never to go in." Then here is a layman at prayer. He is overpowered with emotion. His prayer is not hypocritical; you are sure of that. He feels all that he says. Yet it may chance that, like another such man whom I knew, the grocers have his name in the long list of names of those

whom it is not safe to trust. And then, to conclude our illustrations, did you never know men and women who professed to be in what is called the higher life, and were always calling others up into it, who were so greedy of gold that even their voices had a metallic ring, and whose methods in both business and religious life were more than suggestive of crookedness.

Believe me, not alone among false Christians, but also among true Christians, there is too often a discrepancy between what is *called* spirituality and what is integrity. And because of this discrepancy, we are doing our work as Christians and as churches against odds."

IN THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for April, from the article "Constructive Exegesis," by Prof. Stevens of Rochester, we make the following extracts as being worthy of thoughtful consideration:

"First, the Scriptures should be read consecutively more than it is the fashion now to do, and also in large portions at a time. The preacher must ponder his one text; the exegete spend weeks of critical study upon a single paragraph; a single chapter may be the soul's food for many a devotional hour, and lift it to the seventh heaven of rapture; but this is not the way to know the Bible. We must abandon piecemeal reading, surrender ourselves to the Bible in the spirit of which Mrs. Browning speaks: "Gloriously forget ourselves, and plunge soul-forward, headlong into a book profound, impassioned with its beauty." Chrysostom is said to have had Romans read aloud to him twice a week; we read at the most a chapter at a sitting; yet the whole Gospel of Mark can be deliberately read aloud in two hours, the prophecy of Habakuk in twenty minutes. If we hope to eradicate habits of feeble, intermittent attention and disjointed thinking, if students of the Bible are to be less satisfied with a scrap-book knowledge of its contents and the necessarily superficial or distorted view of its teachings that flourish in such a soil, there is here pointed out one remedial method.

Secondly, with the majority of biblical students their exegetical work should be largely and systematically expended upon an English version. Far be it from the writer to deprecate the study of the original. But the great body of pastors, and also of laymen,

who desire to search the Scriptures for themselves, are conscious of a painfully inadequate knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, or, with the best linguistic training, have but limited leisure for independent exegetical study. What is to be done? Put aside the original? No; but, along with a thorough grammatical scrutiny of special passages in the Greek and Hebrew, let them work on a larger plan with an English version. Many have doubtless been unconsciously deterred from continuous systematic study of the scriptures by the notion that exegesis, properly so called, begins and ends with the original text. On the contrary, there is only here and there a scholar who can apprehend the drift and logical connection of a series of chapters without resorting to the repeated reading of a translation. In order to obtain a single, collective impression, his mind must not be diverted by attention to peculiarities of form or idiom; he must read it in that language in which he can also think."

This is sound and profitable advice, and if followed by religious teachers, we believe that we would soon arrive at that "unity of faith" so much desired by all true Christians. This habit of studying the Bible by verse has been productive of much false teaching. If Luther had followed the suggestion of Prof. Stevens he would never have contended for *transubstantiation*; nor would Wesley have ever written in the Methodist Discipline "That we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort;" nor would Calvin ever have taught his doctrine of *decrees*.

WE WOULD be glad to notice more at length the following exchanges, but want of space prevents. We intend to devote more space hereafter to this department, and publishers sending books for review may rest satisfied that justice will be done them.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, for May, June and July.

The May No. contains an article by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, on "What Does Revelation Reveal?" which is calculated to awaken thought if it does somewhat shock our veneration. "The Spent Bullet," by Gail Hamilton, is the lesson the pessimist learns from the death of Pres. Garfield.

The June No. is a more interesting number, and contains, among others, articles by Dr. L. W. Bacon, "Andover and Creed Subscription"; by Prof. J. W. Dowling, "Old School Medecine and Homœopathy"; and by O. B. Frothingham, "Swedenborg." The first mentioned, as showing the spirit of the religious world, is quite instructive, and I hope to be able to notice it fully in the October number.

Published monthly at 30 Lafayette Place, N. Y. \$5.00 a year.

THE UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, published at 16 Bromfield Street, Boston, \$3.00 a year.

The April No. contains several very interesting articles, one of which, though incorrect in its criticism and conclusion, is well worth careful study, "Use of the Greek Verb *Μέλλω*, by O. D. Miller.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW, published at 907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, \$3.00 a year.

The April No. contains: "Pentateuch Criticism; Its history and present State," by Prof. F. A. Gast; "The Atonement; or, Reconciliation through the Perfect Fulfillment of the Divine Will," by R. Leighton Gerhart; "Was the Messiah to be Divine?" by Daniel Van Pelt; "Punishment; Its Ground and Ends," by Dr. C. R. Lane; "Christian Education and the Public Schools," by Calvin S. Gerhard; "The Dominion of Christ," by D. Y. Heisler; "The Doctrine of Anselm on the Death of Christ," by Dr. E. V. Gerhart.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, published by Phillips & Hunt, 805 Broadway, N. Y., \$2.50 a year.

The April No. contains: 1. Utah and the Mormon Problem, by Andrew J. Hanson. 2. Our Methodist Local Preachers, by Dr. Wheeler. 3. Weber's System of Theology of the Old Synagogue of Palestine, by Dr. H. M. Harman. 4. The Wines of the Bible,

by Leon C. Field. 5. Petersburg, Va., and its Negro Population, by Dr. John E. Edwards.

THE MISSOURI UNIVERSITY REVIEW, published at Columbia, Mo., five numbers each year. Price, \$1.00 a year.

Since our last issue, we have received the April and June Nos., both an improvement, mechanically, on the first, and the third an improvement on the second. We are glad to note this improvement, and now if it were enlarged, it would about satisfy us.

In the April No., there is a very pungent *critique* by the Editor, Dr. Laws, on "Oscar Wilde & Co." An essay by Prof. Conrad Diehl on "The So-called Venus of Melos," shows familiarity with the Subject and a true artist's conception of the work.

The June No. contains the usual amount of sound and instructive editorial, and an address delivered by Hon. George C. Pratt, one of the Railroad Commissioners of Missouri—delivered by request in the Chapel of the University; subject, "Railroad Engineering." To all persons it is worth much more than the price of the magazine. "The Sones in the High Priest's Breastplate," by Prof. J. S. Blackwell, is quite interesting, and like all of his contributions, it is instructive.

ELD. CORTES JACKSON, of Denver, Colorado, is preparing an analytical reference edition of the New Testament; endeavoring to make Scripture explain Scripture. The rule is correct; whether he succeeds is to be decided by his work and the bias of the man who examines it. He makes the Acts of the Apostles the centre, the fulfilment of the Evangelists, and the storehouse of facts used by the writers of the Epistles. I have no doubt but that such a work can be made valuable, but I have not seen enough of it to speak positively. To every Bible student it will be well worth the price.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE USE OF TOBACCO, by Prof. J. I. D. Hinds, Lebanon, Tenn.

This little book of 138 pages comes to us very neatly bound in muslin, and can be bought from the author for seventy-five cts. per copy. It is a timely and temperate discussion of the subject, and contains much valuable statistical, chemical and physiological information. Among other things of interest which we gain from it, we learn that when Columbus landed in Cuba in 1492, he found the natives smoking tobacco. The exact time of the introduction of tobacco into Europe is not known, but probably in 1560. Sir Walter Raleigh introduced the practice of smoking among the nobility and it soon became fashionable. The United States can claim almost a monopoly of chewing tobacco, Europeans (except the sailors and soldiers), not chewing. It belongs to the same family of plants as the night-shade, belladonna, Jimson weed, Irish potato and pepper. The United States generally raises each year 450,000,000 pounds, of which 250,000,000 pounds are exported. Cuba raises 60,000,000 pounds; Austria about 45,000,000 pounds; and France 20,000,000 pounds. Its cultivation is prohibited in England. The United States receives a revenue from tobacco of \$35,000,000; England \$40,000,000; France \$60,000,000, and Austria \$40,000,000. It is estimated that nearly 900,000,000 people use tobacco; 600,000,000 use tea; 400,000,000 use opium, and 100,000,000 use coffee. The active principle of tobacco is nicotine. It is a deadly poison, and produces death more quickly than any other poison except Prussic acid. The author sums up its physiological action and effects thus: Used in moderation it produces no ill effects on most persons; there are many persons to whom the smallest quantities are injurious; even its moderate use is universally hurtful to boys and young men; and intemperately used it causes many diseased conditions of the system. He dis-

cusses these conclusions fully and unanswerably, we think. Its use by chewing is the most injurious, next snuff-taking, and least smoking.

Its use has been opposed almost from its beginning. The most noted paper against it was written by James I. of England, entitled a *Counterblaste to Tobacco*. He characterizes smoking as a custom "loathsome to the eye, harmful to the braine, dangerous to the lungs, and in the black, stinking fumes thereof nearest resembling the horrible Stygian smoke of the pit that is bottomless." He further said if he were to invite the devil to dinner, he would have three dishes: *A pig; a pole of ling and mustard; and a pipe of tobacco.*

We recommend every user of tobacco, especially young men, to procure the book and read it.

'LOOKING DOWN THE AGES FROM A PROPHETIC STANDPOINT, by Jno. T Walsh. John Burns, Publisher, 717 Olive St., St. Louis.

This is the title of a wonderful book. The author deals in wonders in a wonderful way. He ascends the prophetic heights and looks from what he calls the "Lord's Land" (Palestine) and the tops of her "monumental mountains," on and on, even to "The End or Final Adjudication." And while the reader may not be able to see all that the author claims to see, and may not agree with him as to the meaning of each prophecy, still to look as he looks cannot fail to stir the soul and quicken the hope of every one who believes the Bible to be the Word of God.

We cannot enter upon any criticism of the work, to indicate what we believe to be its errors, or to emphasize its truths. Some of its divisions we here mention that the reader may have some idea of the general scope of the book, viz.: "The Restoration of Israel," "The Conversion of Israel," "Physical Changes in and around Jerusalem," "The Times of the Gentiles," "The Judgment of Christendom," "The Destiny of the Earth," "The Day of the Lord," "The Signs of Christ's Coming," "The Reign of Christ on the Earth," "The Ministry of the Glorified Saints," "The Age of Peace and Righteousness," "The New Heavens and Earth," "Heaven—Paradise Restored," "The Continuity of the Race," "The Final Adjudication."

The "rules of interpretation" which the author claims to follow he gives thus :

1. "In all of our interpretations of the scriptures, *the literal sense* is always to be chosen, unless there is evident necessity for adopting the *figurative*.

2. "In the interpretation of the *prophecies* the fact must not be forgotten that, not infrequently, the text and context are disconnected, and have no direct reference to each other—the prediction standing alone.

3. "It is an important rule of interpretation that many prophecies have a *proximate* and a *remote* fulfillment.

4. "The *literal* and *figurative* are often mingled together in the same *prophecies*, and require great care and discrimination to understand them.

5. "Synonymous words and phrases can always be substituted one for the other, without in any way impairing or destroying the sense.

6. "In all of our interpretations of the word of God, supreme regard must be had to the *then current meaning and use* of words, as they were employed by the sacred writers of the Old and New Testaments."

The book is well executed mechanically, and the type and paper are all that could be desired. Why the Greek words are not printed in Greek letters and Hebrew words in the Hebrew characters, instead of the wretched attempt to spell them with English letters, is a mystery. This is a fault that could have been easily avoided, in our opinion.

THE GOSPEL AND THE EKKLESIA, two pamphlets of 24 and 28 pp., by John Calien Risk, of Canton, Mo. Price of each, 20 cts.; of both 30 cents.

In the April No. of this magazine we promised to make a more extended notice of these essays. We do so cheerfully, as we feel that much good would be accomplished by their extensive circulation, and we hope the brethren will circulate them. The presentation is entirely scriptural and hence correct. It is simple, easy to be understood, and therefore apt to convince.

Under the general head of THE WORSHIP he says :

"2. *They continued steadfastly in the fellowship.* The Greek term *κοινωνία* may comprehend more than the contribution, but it certainly includes it, as is evident from this expression: 'make a certain contribution for the poor saints.' On church finance the following is exhaustive: 'concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come.' 1. The object is stated, 'collection for the saints,' which doubtless includes all monied wants. 2. Its application is general, 'as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye.' 4. The donors are specified, 'let every one of you, the poor and wealthy.' 5. The treasury is named, 'lay by him in store.' 6. The amount is specified, 'as God hath prospered him'; and lastly, the completeness of the collection is cited, 'that there be no gatherings when I come.' This scripture excludes modern fairs and festivals for church benefit and exalts the weekly contribution. The Christian should on every Lord's Day take a hasty mental inventory of his business during the past week, and if he has prospered to the amount of tens, or hundreds, then he ought to honor his religion with a fair per cent. of his gains."

We give the above extract as a specimen of the two essays, and we fully endorse it.

NOTICE:

To any of the subscribers of this magazine who do not wish to preserve it, if they will send me their copies of the January No., I will pay fifty cents per copy if in good condition, or twenty-five cents if much soiled. I am needing copies of the April No on the same terms. Direct to

E. W. HERNDON,
Columbia, Boone Co., Mo.

ARTICLES from contributors have crowded out my review of Canon Farrar. It is ready for publication, and I hope to find room for it in the October number.

ERRATA:

Page 2, 11th line from top, after the word "man" read—sustains to others and that others—.

In 17th line from bottom, understand a comma after danger, and change places of *of* and *at least*.

Page 6, 7th line from top, for "and an active" read—and be an active.

Page 10, 17th line from top, after the word "body," which should be followed by a comma, read—but only that they are all branches of one and the same body.

Page 12, 15th line from bottom, read "wide," instead of "wider."

Page 14, 10th line from bottom, after the word "precious" read—ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house.

Same page, 11th and 12th lines from top, for "this faith," read—the faith.

Page 18, 9th line from bottom, after the words "the remission of sins," read—But this denominational teaching says, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth and is not baptized, shall be saved as well. Peter says, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins," and Christ says, "Except ye be born of water and of the Spirit ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Page 21, 4th line from top, after the word "church," omit—or if we include in our church fellowship those whom God does not exclude from his church.

Page 118, 24th line from top, after "prefer" add "and."

PAPERS AND PERIODICALS.

NOTE. The following is a list of the papers—weekly and monthly—published in the interest of the Christian Church. The list includes those published in the United States and elsewhere, so far as the names could be obtained:

WEEKLIES.

Christian Standard, Isaac Errett, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Christian, J. H. Garrison, J. H. Smart, St. Louis, Missouri.
The Evangelist, B. W. Johnson, B. J. Radford, Chicago, Illinois.
Christian Preacher, C. M. Wilmeth, Dallas, Texas.
The Gospel Advocate, David Lipscomb, Nashville, Tennessee.
Christian Messenger, T. R. Burnett, Bonham, Texas.
Apostolic Times, J. W. Cox, Lexington, Kentucky.
Atlantic Missionary, P. S. Rhodes, Gordonsville, Virginia.
American Christian Review, J. F. Rowe, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Old Path Guide, F. G. Allen, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Christian Commonwealth, W. T. Moore, London, England.
The Faithful Witness, J. M. Shepherd, Topeka, Kansas.

MONTHLIES.

Christian Monitor, Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin, St. Louis, Missouri.
The Watch Tower, J. L. Winfield, Washington, North Carolina.
Bible Index and Christian Sentinel, H. McDiarmid, Toronto, Canada.
Christian Worker, R. B. Neal, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Apostolic Church, W. L. Butler, Mayfield, Kentucky.
The Christian Foundation, Aaron Walker, Kokomo, Indiana.
The Christian Missionary, R. Moffet, F. M. Green, Cleveland, Ohio.
The Christian Telescope, J. M. Ratcliffe, Watkinsville, Georgia.
The Pacific Church News, J. H. McCollough, San Francisco, Cal.
The Christian Advocate, G. Y. Tickle, Edinburgh, Scotland.
Australian Christian Advocate, T. Smith, Melbourne, Australia.
The New Eng. Evangelist, F. N. Calvin and A. Martin, Worcester, Mass.
The Pastoral and Missionary Helper, Browning & Welch, Shelbyville, Mo.

SEMI-MONTHLIES.

The Disciple, Thomas H. Blenus, River John, N. S.
Ecclesiastical Observer, David King, Birmingham, England.
Christian at Work, J. R. Farron, W. A. Cooke, Bell's Depot, Tenn.

SUNDAY SCHOOL PAPERS—MONTHLY.

The Teacher's Mentor, Isaac Errett, F. M. Green, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Christian Sunday School Teacher, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.
Parents' and Teachers' Monthly, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Gospel Techer, J. H. Hardin, St. Louis, Missouri.

WEEKLY.

Sunday School Standard, ———, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The Little Christian, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.
The Little Sower, W. W. Dowling, St. Louis, Missouri.
Good Words, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Little Child, ———, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Little Pearls, C. C. Cline, Louisville, Kentucky.
The Sunny Side, J. H. Hardin, St. Louis, Missouri.
The Little Ones, B. W. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois.

THE REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1882.

"WHAT IS YOUR LIFE?"

(JAMES 4:14.)

The chief design of the apostle in this interrogatory is not so much to secure a response to a really great question, as to rebuke that arrogant spirit, so common among men, and so painfully illustrative of the dominance of the lower faculties. A spirit which assumes the proprietorship of human life, and presumes to dispose of it with indifference to, if not in defiance of any Divine ordination.

The skepticism and weakness of men to-day, are manifest I think, in few things more, than in the disposition to control time and events, to wrest life from the restraints and guidance of higher law, and the sovereign sway of Him, of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things. This temper results in the utter perversion and waste of life, both in the thought and habit of men. To abash and quench this spirit, the Apostle presents that fickleness and uncertainty of life which are characteristic of its lower forms, and of which the living no less than the dead, furnish impressive illustrations. In the present order of things, there is nothing in our human life which necessitates or justifies any spirit, habit, or purpose, and in the progress of it, which violates the design of the Creator, or any high law of the rational being. The very weakness and vanity of life, when it is apprehended and appropriated as a gift from God, in which He has a

NOTE. This article was delivered as the Baccalaureate Sermon at the Missouri State University, Columbia, Mo., May 28th, 1882.

purpose of infinite proportions, may be in-woven with the strength and glory of its immortality. We need a comprehensive view of life, to see it on all sides, else we shall grope among its littlenesses, and never attain to its best coronation.

In nothing with which our personality is identified do such extremes meet, nothing is susceptible of such varied definition, nothing combines such insignificance with such real infinity of scope, as this marvelous and solemn life of ours. It is only a span and yet it seems to come up from eternity and to face toward the infinite beyond; it is a quick, faint flash, and yet it gleams with the lustre of many suns; it can waste and vanish in issues as worthless as the clods that fill its grave, and yet it can write *Paradise Lost*, invent the *Telegraph*, compose and sing the *Messiah*, and paint the *Transfiguration*. There is nothing so uncertain, nothing so set about with constant peril, and yet nothing that involves so much for each of us.

We may know little or much, be wholly unlearned in technicalities, or as familiar with books and science as a child is with its toys, and yet we cannot tell what will be on the morrow, or how we shall be involved in it. On every hand there are strange and seemingly disastrous limitations put upon us. We climb as we think to the summit of some mount of transfiguration and our pulse stops just as the sheen of its glory is beginning to settle upon us. We hurry to manhood, turn the corner, and bowed with age approach the portal that opens to our tottering step, and we are here no more. Nothing is so multiform, nothing is so ever-vanishing as our life. Our dusty achievements often survive that aspect of life in which many men live and think most. There is doubtless much in life to justify this depressing utterance of Edmund Burke; "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue." But there is really no necessity that we should be shadows, or that we should pursue shadows. If men do not get inspiration and wring victory from the very limitations of our passing life, it is because their larger limitation is to be found in their narrow and perverted apprehension of the scope of life. But there are other aspects of life than the merely physical, and I propose on this occasion that this question shall include something of that higher and nobler compass of life to which so many voices call us to-day.

It is only when human life is degraded from its higher possibilities and aims, only when its master forces are perverted, and its great opportunities are neglected, that we need ask this question with the particular emphasis of the Apostle in this connection. In any event the question is vital. Such momentous issues harbor in its bosom, and there is such a marvelous unity in all the combinations of our life, that its brief, weak, physical side is not unimportant. A man may well have respect for his body, and look well to the laws by which it is developed and guarded, since God conferred such dignity upon it as to make it in all truest natures, the temple of the Holy Ghost. But a man for considerations purely selfish may look well to his body, and never come to this distinction, and the occasion of his mistake will consist largely in his misapprehension of the true character and compass of life.

What is life? What is your life? In connection with and independent of personality this question has challenged the learning and the speculation of all the ages. Philosophy and science never labored with such diligence, and in some part never with such commendable success in attempting to solve this question as in these later times. This marvelous principle of life challenges the attention of every man who is capable of thought, and in anywise recognizes the sovereignty with which God has endowed him. We may not be able to penetrate all its intricate maze, for it is a greater mystery than death, but we are bound to give some solution of it, and upon that solution every thing depends. The propounding of a question like this at once brings man to a crisis in life, and all the faculties and hopes of his being cluster about and clamor for some response to it. To settle this question is to settle many others, and I am glad to know that nothing is more in the way of all false theories of men than this very problem of human conscious life. Every man who claims to have and is at all qualified to advance any theory, whether of scientific knowledge or of moral belief, is bound to make some disposition of this life of ours, for there is no separating the theories of men from the rational man himself.

A proper apprehension of this profound question furnishes not only the key to numerous other mysteries, but it lies at the foundation of all right development and exercise of our noblest faculties, of all most excellent and enduring happiness, and of all

triumph and success which not only bear testimony to the great truth of immortality but make our human life the sublimest material manifestation of God on earth. I think it requires no marvelous gift of intellect to observe that the fundamental error of all unbelief, whether in thought or conduct, lies in a narrow, perverted view of life, a view wholly unworthy of it, and hence the lack of the permanent success of all those who toil only for the meat which perisheth, or set themselves to beat back that faith which started at Bethlehem, and resistless as the ocean's tide, is bound to flood the ages.

The infidel, you will notice, can always dispose of life sooner than the man whose higher faculties of reverence and faith hold sway; so can the materialist, the worldling, the sensualist, or even the mere moralist. To these, life consists in one or two things, and these lie on the surface; it is force under law, an opportunity, an accident, a summer day, if not a wasting plague, all of which are set aside in a moment, by the man who has any correct view of the dignity and possibilities of life itself. Indeed, my young friends, every man's view and use of life constitute some true measurement of himself. No man's appreciation and employment of life will rise above the character of his manhood; hence, he is justly regarded as an epicure, a victim of appetite, who says, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Wherever the animal is supreme in man, the compass of life in his habit and thought will not rise above the material and sensual. You may see already how important it is that our view of life be so true and so comprehensive as to be worthy of it; and such it must be, else the being that we are, and all the mighty destiny within our reach will not only vanish in hopeless failure, but insure a calamity as endless as immortality itself.

You have attained to a pleasing, yet solemn crisis in your history. You are about to assume in a more personal way the responsibilities of life, to go out from this honored University with its endowment upon you, to achieve a destiny for yourselves which sooner or later will stand out to the gaze of men and angels as the sublimest of triumphs, or the most pitiable of failures. As I look down upon you, and attempt to sweep my vision around those vast issues which belong to the hour, and centre in each of you, and in no small degree involve the honor of your *alma mater*, and

the well-being of all with whom you may come in contact, it seems to me the very heavens must be hushed into awe for a moment, while you listen to, and rise up to some correct response to the text—"What is your life?" If there is any question in the right solution and appreciation of which man needs more than the illumination of human wisdom, it is this one. It is very true that the responses to it are many, some of them are peculiar to the time, and any of them, it will be seen, partake more or less of the culture and character of those who venture to ask or answer. Whatever these responses be, they must be subjected to that test which the results they produce furnish, and by these they stand or fall. If it be found that any theory of life be out of harmony with and insufficient to meet the highest wants, or to illustrate the noblest elements of life, then that theory must be set aside. Every definition of our conscious rational life which is meant to include its origin, spirit and purpose, is to me wholly unsatisfactory in the proportion that it partakes of the material and the human. After the philosopher, and scientist, and avowed unbeliever have done their best, still great desires and mighty questions which these have not satisfied, disturb my soul, and I remain unrecovered to that harmony and hope which give to life a charm, and thrill the soul with a perpetual and holy inspiration.

I might say to you, aim to excel in the calling you have chosen, and the advice would be proper, but superficial, if in that I meant to convey to you any just idea of the sublime and true compass of life. Is the merchant a whole success when he has acquired a fortune? Yes, but so is the busy ant, for it too has reared a pile of dust.

No man has discovered what life is, or employed it well who has only succeeded in conforming to those conditions which give him access to some particular sphere of labor, or worldly distinction. All of these must be insufficient for the reason that while there may have been an exhibition of skill, the noblest faculties of the man have been left untouched. To urge a young man to be law-abiding, industrious, and to attain to success and place in his particular calling is good counsel, but if you mean by that the sum and best rule of life, you have placed him within a small circle, and if the great soul in him be not bound in the delusion, he will challenge you for more, and more than you can furnish, with

all the resources of science and mere learning at your back.

Where, then, shall we go to learn that true philosophy of our human life, which not only responds to the deepest and noblest longings of our being, but actually recovers us to far more than our present limitations intimate we have lost? We must go to the fountain head. We must follow the stream that is turbulent and cloudy from the washings of the way, back to its crystal source. The key to the mystery of my life was picked up from the shattered threshold of Eden and has been handed to me by the pierced hand of the Son of God, and, now, it is so far and so sublimely disclosed that the very method is an image of my possible greatness, and contains an inspiration equal to the fact, and any violence or perversion of it is not only an unspeakable disaster to myself, but a crime against God and the universe. I dare to say, my young friends, without knowing what relation you sustain to the Christian faith and life, that I can find no satisfactory, no intelligent, and no really noble response to this great question, save in that inspired revelation which came down from God out of heaven, and which is not more a revelation to man, than it is a revelation of man.

After I have stood and listened long to voices from high places and from low, and looked upon the results of the many theories of men, I am to-day, more, than at any other period of my life, confirmed in the belief that He who is the Author of my being has given the only true answer to all it is, and to all it has been appointed to. This answer I find not only in the Gospel as a written revelation, but in Him who is the spirit, power and impersonation of the Gospel. When I open God's book, still more when through it I look at Him who is the image of the invisible God, I find myself opening gates long closed to the temple of my being, and to His divine touch I see that these gates become pearl, and the broken columns and begrimed arches of the marvelous ruin are renewed, and take on the glow of heaven, and the life that was only a convenience, a drudgery, a plague, a maze, a dream, a gloomy cloud, becomes a conscious fact, an unearthly apocalypse, a thrilling hope, a sounding psalm, a reflection of God himself. Who can answer this question for himself or others and who has not learned where his life-roots are struck, and what God has done to recover to excellence and power the scarred image it still conceals under its de-

formity. It is vital that you settle in your minds, first of all, the fact that you are no thing of chance, no mere product of nature, no "*survival of the fittest*" from a meaner growth which has had the dignity of precedence, but a creation of God more wonderful than the "morning stars," and mightier than the "rock-ribbed" mountains, or the majestic seas.

The Apostle honored his manhood, and gave some noble response to the query of the text, when giving it a higher application, he made the poetry of the heathen philosopher speak the truth of God, as pointing away from the numerous and senseless divinities of Athens, to the one Supreme Jehovah, he said, "We are all his offspring." Sublime declaration! Startling revelation of a truth to which everything great and imperishable in man makes hearty response. He who builds the fabric of his life in recognition and right appreciation of this great thought, will not fail to put it far above the estimate of the mere materialist or sensualist; he will look upon it as a self-conscious existence capable of vast and holy expansion, appointed to a ministry that would not demean an angel, and that will culminate in a still higher than angelic promotion. The Apostle in another place touches the origin, as well as defines in some measure the finite and the infinite in our nature when he says—"The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." Every man in some way illustrates this wonderful combination—a creature and a son. Of the latter he may be unconscious, as he is certainly unworthy, still in clear distinction from all other creation, there are links, often concealed and rusty, that bind every rational being to God. Martineau says, "Each of the two characters (creature and son) has its trace within us and makes itself felt by desires and sufferings of its own; the consciousness of the natural, ever sinking on the finite, and the consciousness of the spiritual, ever rising toward the infinite, co-exist and wrestle in our nature." But remember that for such a thrilling revelation as this, and for any intelligent moving consciousness of it, we are wholly indebted to the inspired word of God, and to the person and life of Jesus Christ, through whom alone this fact of son-ship becomes once more a sublime hope and a real and joyous experience. In any event, life gets an unspeakable dignity, takes on a wider compass, and we apprehend in it a far greater capacity when we see that

man is more than a creature, "born to take a place and pass away among the organisms of this earth." He shares the freedom of a conscious personal existence, his lineage is divine, and God is his Father. When the soul advances to the hearty recognition and proper exercise of the sublime functions of this relationship, then life gets its true exaltation, its compass is measured by and swallowed up in Christ, and to the question, "What is your life?" the man points to Him, who in what He was and did, brought life and immortality to light in the Gospel. It is greatly to our advantage that there is so much within us to respond to these facts. To quote the language of M. Martineau again, "There are some real vestiges in our humanity of something transcending the fabricated creature—of some living relationship with the Parent-spirit, some real communion with his holy nature, some melting of our finite into sympathy with his infinite. Surely the depth and significance of life must be half missed by those who do not find such vestiges in all the higher endowments and experiences of our being." You are the sons of the mighty God, and in any noble calling you may select, you may march to the coronation to which sons only are entitled, if the spirit and aim of your living go to swell the harmony of this thrilling and ennobling truth. As you look out upon the life before you, I bid you uncover and stand in reverent awe of this momentous revelation. With what unspeakable significance it invests your being! Into what sublime companionship it puts you! What a street of gold it opens before your advancing step, and to what gates of beauty and glory it leads you! Own and honor the celestial dignity, in all you are and do recognize your Divine paternity, throw back the excellence of your character and life until it blends with the infinite light out of which it came unsoiled and strong, and you will not fail of such a crown as the Author of your being alone can bestow.

But the Christian Scriptures discover to us not only the origin of our being, but as well reveal the true spirit and aim of it. It avails man nothing and furnishes life with no inspiring impulse, to know his divine origin, if he ignores that spirit and aim which God has declared to be only worthy of a human life. Indeed, no man makes any just recognition of the high source of his being who lives in indifference to that character and end of life which God has appointed. Christ as the image of the invisible God, not

only announces, but in himself illustrates what is the only true interpretation of life. He has left us to conjecture nothing, not even do we find it necessary to experiment; there is no long problem to work out before we can arrive at any intelligent conclusion—life is too short for that. The revelation is distinct, simple, as intelligible to the child as to the sage, and sometimes in comprehending it the child is the master of the sage.

Great and necessary as are these institutions of learning, you need not come here to learn what are to be the true and dominant spirit and aim of life, but if you do come, you will never be able to do such an institution the honor it merits at your hands, unless the tone and purpose of your being come to be such as God has appointed. God has given to every man such gifts as that he may see, when he cannot fully comprehend logical and formulated statements of truth, in the life and temper of Jesus Christ, what his own are to be, and must be, if in any measure he would achieve the mission of his being. Our Lord says "The life is more than meat;"—there are higher elements in it than the material suggests, and these higher faculties must attain to dominance, if life would rise to that capacity and dignity which its own possibilities warrant, and if it would be worthy of Him who set and keeps its pulses going. It is plain enough that we have an endowment that puts us in relation to this material world. These hands, these eyes, this entire material organism indicates that we have something to do even with the visible and the perishable. Everything is good that challenges honest industry and skill. In all good and commendable enterprise God comes to work with us as in grace; in all the lower forms and offices of life, we are to find a discipline which while making us good servants to others on the one hand, will the better fit us for the appreciation and exercise of higher faculties on the other. Working in and with the material, we are to keep the spirit and aim of life above these perishable things, and wherever there is disregard of this high law, wherever the personal man is made the slave, instead of the master of any earthly pursuit, no matter what the method is, and though the achievement may have startled the world, and brought many a crown to the shrine of triumphant genius, the victor has after all spent himself—the imperishable for the perishable.

Wisdom is a good thing, so is unsullied ambition, so is wealth,

all great forces; our civilization would soon be touched with wasting blight without them. God is the author of all of them. He does not condemn them. But He does condemn their misplacement, their perversion, and that unjustifiable promotion to the thrones of human life by which these things are glorified, sometimes deified, and the personal, immortal man is enslaved, dethroned, discrowned. Here the aim and spirit of life are wrong and the spirit is everything. "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches, but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth."

How many lives there are, nobly endowed, crowned with the honors of men, triumphant in this empire and in that, and yet as remote as the poles from that great function and sublime aim of life set forth in the language of the prophet just quoted. They are perchance wise, famed, powerful, at home it may be in this department of philosophy and science, capable of penetrating where the common crowd never deigns to go, all thrilled with their discoveries, and quite infatuated with the hope that by and by the keys of the universe will be put into their hands, and theirs shall be the glory of sitting on the dictator's throne, and determining the philosophies of the world, and yet, do you know, that by the high verdict of the infallible revelation, and the great faculties that yet stir in them, but have never been satisfied, these have not commenced to live yet. The higher and nobler faculties are yet untouched; the man is developed only on one side, and that is the poorest, he is not an illustration of that great life which comes up fresh and beautiful as an angel out of God's great rescue, and is instinct with the purpose of Him who came that men might not only have life, but have it more abundantly. At the very gateway of life and as essential to a right spirit and aim in it, I put a knowledge of God. There is a disposition to-day to live and achieve independent of Him—it is a peril against which I urge you who are young, just starting in the race of life with all its great possibilities challenging all your faculties, to guard with sacred and sleepless vigilance. And when I say, know God, I mean the personal God, the God who made you and would have His way in

your life, more really than He has it in the stars and in the seas. Believe in law, but make every law carry you to God; raise no shout save to that Adorable Presence in whose light you stand. You can know nothing else as you ought, and do nothing as you should, until you know God. Let science be to you but a blazing lamp, lighting your way to the throne of the Eternal. I cannot conceive a more melancholy spectacle than a man of some learning, of scientific attainment, who is ignorant of a personal God, and indifferent to his moral relation to Him. He is weaker than many an illiterate toiler, and in all those greatest thoughts which ever beat upon a human brain, and as a model of life, he is a blank. He walks in darkness with all of his light and knoweth it not. He spends his life in exploring the temple, "but never turns a loving eye to the God whose glory fills it; he has penetrated a thousand rocks, but knows not the Rock of Ages; he has questioned innumerable orbs, but never communed with the Bright and Morning Star; he is familiar with every flower which adorns the coronal of spring, but never owned the Rose of Sharon." This man is not breathing the breath of that life that will be worth saving in the final wreck, and in the time to come when the unseen and eternal shall encompass us, every rock, every star, every flower, every law of nature will become an avenging force and smite the man who spent a life in God's temple without knowing that God had a throne there, and that from it went forth the high law by which he was to be governed and the light by which he might have risen to the power of an endless life. How different with him, the spirit and aim of whose life centers in God. Pursue what branch he will, be engaged in whatever sphere, he continually reverts to the Infinite Source of all—he *glories* "not in the architecture but in the architect, not in the ladder on which angels travel, but in the God against whose heart the head of the ladder rests." He only knows what life is, he only is in anywise fulfilling his great mission who in all endeavor keeps God enthroned, and in every achievement worthy of a true manhood, gets some glimpse of Him whose kingdom ruleth over all. He not only knows God as a mighty and invisible force in creation, but he has seen Him in the face of Jesus Christ. God is not simply to this man a Creator, but as well and more consciously a Moral Governor—he feels the throb of His heart, "His heart! that dread sanctuary of righteousness, that

sempiternal font of love." He sees the same hand that kindled the sun resting in benediction on the head of a little child, wiping away the tears of human sorrow, and stretched and quivering in bloody agony on the cross for a dying world, and this to him is the ideal of greatness and power and of every other element worthy of a God, and possible to a redeemed child.

And this is life—life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. This noblest, and most inclusive and most essential of all acquisitions at once puts a new heart into a man and henceforth life must thrill with a diviner spirit, and push to a diviner end.

And what does all this intimate but there is no such thing as acquiring and illustrating the true aim and spirit of human life, but by giving the largest cultivation to the higher and nobler faculties of our nature. I charge it upon you, my young friends, to make manly recognition of your nobler being, and to give prompt and faithful attention to those faculties which most of all distinguish you above the irrational, and ally you to God. To neglect the moral and spiritual faculties is to fling life's best chance, its noblest endowment into the dust, and to write "Ichabod" on every gate of the wonderful temple of your being. For these larger, supream faculties, which give infinite scope and a destiny, as sublime as it is immortal, to life, there is no substitute. Life is poor, scant, mean, the most striking illustration of disparity between itself and those who are passing through it, when it consists only in things that can be counted, handled and consumed in the fire. He is a dwarf, a rational deformity who is developed only on the dusty side of himself. That sort of a life is a vapor, and while the stars declare God's glory, and every flower interprets some thought of Him, such a life throws a shadow back upon the hand that formed it, and drops out of God's great harmony of purpose concerning us.

I have said there is no substitute for the moral and spiritual faculties and no man is the illustration of a true manhood in whom the highest and best elements possible to us do not have sway. Dr. Hopkins, in addressing the students of Williams College a few years ago, said what applies with equal force now. These are his words:

"You live in a day when science is making great progress, and you are

called upon to advance and honor science. Science is simply a knowledge of the works of God as they are revealed under uniform laws of succession and construction. This knowledge the Bible favors. It tells us that 'the works of God are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein.' Let them be thus sought out. They ought to be. But when men suppose that science is all; when they begin to talk about the majesty of impersonal law in the place of a personal God; when, instead of making this magnificent and amazing scene of uniformities but the outer court of God's temple, they make it a finality, cutting it off from the sanctities of religion and the higher glories of the upper temple; they dwarf both it and themselves, and not only make that which is so beautiful in its place to be an insolvable enigma, but, as offering itself to meet the highest human wants, they make it to be a failure and deformity. Science is good, but with no revealed system to meet the higher wants of man, it is a pillar crowned with no capital, an avenue terminated by no mansion, and ignoring that which is highest, it falls back into rejections and pettinesses. There is no narrower man, often none more bigoted, than he who thinks that science is all. With his spiritual faculties undeveloped, self-complacent from defect, plodding and sneering in his little round of uniformities, he is but half a man. * * * Science is good. It gives control over nature. It is the basis of art. It ministers to comfort and to taste. But it eradicates no evil passion. It does not reach the deep springs of human action, so as to control character; and hence it cannot renovate society. It can assuage no grief. It stands at the door of the tomb and is dumb. It knows nothing of sin, or of redemption, or of prayer and communion with God, or of a judgment day. It has not one property of a corner-stone on which you can build for eternity."

What is said of science is just as true of all those material forces and prizes which challenge the faculties and enchain the life of man to-day. Good in their place, we demean them, and discrown ourselves when we make any of them a chief good. If you would be well-rounded men, men of power, men of divinest companionship and widest influence, be men of Christian faith, give wide scope to those faculties which can only be nobly employed and fully satisfied at the altars of God. Science may boast that it goes only where it can see, but I make it bow to the golden sceptre God has placed in my palm, when by that faith which includes the highest knowledge, the noblest reverence, and a celestial promotion, I go unblushed of fear, and joyous with hope where I cannot see. I know how you will be tempted to walk only by sight—then, you must be content to plod about in the outer court of this great life of ours, but into its higher and holier sanctities, into its master privileges and possibilities, and into that apocalypse of it which is grand as any John's rapt vision saw on

Patmos, and stretches, a sublime reality all unutterable to me, across the eternities of God, you can never come. To "take nothing on trust, to fasten the thread of every enterprise on fixed laws of nature, to venture into no field that is unexplored, to fill up no blank with images of thought, but turn away from the invisible because it is not visible," this, to the mere man of intellect, to the sensualist, to the worldling is the maxim of highest prudence, and in consequence such a man grows only on the creature side, and is a failure here, and a self-tortured waste hereafter.

Without faith it is impossible to please God, and that is to say, that without faith we have no life beyond mere secular materialism—the image lost in Eden, is lost forever. If you would grow your being into completeness, and exalt your life above the mere symbols and emblems of it about us, which are changing as the seasons, then, through Him who is both light and life, and who came to enlarge our life, give cultivation to all those faculties which distinguish between the creature and the son—those secret wonders which make us feel the universe to be sacred and are a virtual thirst for God. I thank God, that from all these material things and systems, however great, the soul now and again turns away, and up through the rubbish unbelief has heaped upon it, and over its vaunting boast great instincts and a subtle faith struggle and voice themselves out in desires the poet has well expressed in these words:

"Oh, give me back a world of life;
Something to love and trust,
Something to quench my inward strife,
And lift me from the dust.

"I cannot live with nature dead,
Mid laws and causes blind,
Powerless on earth or overhead
To trace all-guiding Mind.

"Better the instinct of the brute
That feels its God afar,
Than reason to His praises mute,
Talking with every star.

"Better the thousand deities
That swarmed in Greece of yore
Than thought that scorns all mysteries,
And dares all depths to explore.

"Better is childhood's thoughtless trust
Than manhood's daring scorn;
The fear that creeps along the dust
Than doubt in hearts forlorn.

"And knowledge, if it cost so dear,
If such be reason's day,
I'll lose the pearl without a tear,
And grope my star-lit way.

"And be the toils of wisdom cursed
If such the meed we earn;
If freezing pride and doubt are nursed,
And faith forbid to burn."

With such faculties as faith and love and self-denial, and hope and spiritual apprehension, all in growth and exercise, life moves in the consciousness and under the inspiration of an ordination of God, and what it is and shall achieve can only be read in that ever-unfolding purpose, and ever-radiant glory of its Divine Author.

It was my purpose to speak with some detail of the possibilities of such a life, and thereby give you to see more of its wonderful compass, but compelled to write amid the distraction of much interruption, I found myself embarrassed with having undertaken too much, when my limited time was too far spent to retrace my steps and change the structure of my discourse, and hence I must leave you to conceive if you can, what may be the issues of one single life, spent in harmony with its own master faculties, and God's revealed will concerning it.

And, now my young friends, I have brought to your attention a thought or two—only a thought or two out of the almost exhaustless depths which surge about this mighty theme. Shall not this limited effort be sufficient to clothe the question of the text for each of you with momentous significance? "What is your life?" What is your solemn thought and purpose, as from these sacred shrines, with an enlarged endowment upon you, with a vaster promise, and a weightier responsibility as well, you approach such doors of usefulness as open before you? "What is your life?" What is it to be as you contemplate the relationships you sustain to mankind and to God? Made in the image of God, recovered to vaster conditions of being than those forfeited in Eden, capable of

indefinite progress, of falling to a depth profound in proportion to the height to which you can rise, let me hush you into reverent awe, while I ask, "What is your life?" What is it to be in the history of a favored race, and in the destinies of a solemn future?

What boundless resources challenge all your powers! What untold possibilities centre in each of you! What a wealth of endowment is yours! What riches are held in the inheritance of which you are the favored heirs! Those who have gone before you toiled and suffered and died in order that they might bequeath to you a heritage of knowledge, and invention, and freedom, and mechanism, and power, and civilization that have lifted the age into a transfiguration of wonder and splendor, and all these are resources ready to do your bidding. As you stand among them, majestic, mightier than all of them if you choose, "What is your life?" What is it to be! O the boundless enlargement of which you are capable! Dare you trifle with, dare you pervert the high end of rational existence and dash to hopeless waste that life of yours which in worth excels gold and gems, suns and systems, and all the sciences that may be known, though they branch out into infinity. Rather shall we not hope that you will aspire, nay resolve to be men. The sublime race of life is before you. Go to God and let Him gird you for it, and then, when your arm drops, your weary but winning hand will hold in its grasp the immortal diadem. Live high up; bring all gifts to God's altar; make your spiritual being supreme, "by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the armor of righteousness," by all highest and divinest forces bind your life to the holiest purposes, to the highest interests of the race, to God himself, and He will bind you to His throne, and to the question, "What is your life?" you may point for an answer to those results which on earth have reared a monument to your memory more enduring than marble or bronze, and to that reward which is God's gift, and the endowment of a son, celestial and immortal in heaven.

EXEGESIS OF JOHN 16:8.—MISSION OF THE SPIRIT.

"And when he is come, he will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."

Based upon this passage of scripture, the religious world has been treated to a dogma, representing the Holy Spirit as going out into the world and abstractly, or immediately, acting upon the hearts of sinners to convince them of sin. A careful, logical and scriptural exegesis of the passage may be of service to the thoughtful and honest enquirer.

A forthcoming fact, or transaction, is predicted by the Savior to his apostles; but the full scope and meaning of the fact may not at the first glance, flash upon the mind of the casual reader.

A fact is an action, and there are certain circumstances surrounding or connected with every action from which, as standpoints, we may examine the action, and learn what may be known concerning it. These refer to agent, action, place, aids, cause, manner and time; and by logicians have been formulated into a line of Latin pentameter verse, thus: "*quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando*," which in plain English asks the questions, who? what? where? with what aids? why? how? when?

To know an object well, we must view it from different standpoints. If you have seen a house only from one view, you may not recognize it when approached from a different direction.

I purpose examining this theme, from the seven standpoints above named, and in the same logical order, except to let *time* follow the *act*. It will be seen that Jesus answers all these questions, and I present his answers in his own language.

I. FROM STANDPOINTS ANTECEDENT TO THE FACT.

a. *Who?* "When he is come, he will convince the world of sin," etc., verse 8. But who is "he"? "If I go not away the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart I will send him to you," verse 7. But who is "the Comforter?" "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father,

even the spirit of truth [of the truth] which proceeds from the Father," John 15:26. Then "he" is the Comforter, the spirit of the truth, or the Holy Spirit. So far we have plain sailing. The Holy Spirit is to do this work of convincing.

b. What? The Holy Spirit as agent, will do what? "He will convince the world of [$\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$] sin, and of [$\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$] righteousness, and of [$\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$] judgment," verse 8. Here the subject of the proposition is "he," with the simple predicate "will convince." The word for "convince" is rendered "reprove" in the common version; but the scholarship of the world endorses *convince* as a better rendering. If a man is convinced of sin, he is convicted of sin, and stands reprov'd *for* sin. But "he" is to convince the world of ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$, concerning,) three things, viz: concerning sin, concerning righteousness, and concerning judgment. While the rendering "reprove," might do in relation to *sin*, to "reprove the world of righteousness," would scarcely be admissable. "Convict," as used in the revised version, may express its relation to *sin*, but *convince* covers the whole ground, and is preferable.

The "sin" is the sin of unbelief in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah. The "righteousness" is not that of men, but the righteousness or justification of Jesus from the charge upon which he was condemned to death. The "judgment" is not a judgment to come, but the unjust judgment of the court below, set aside and reversed by the supreme court above. All which will appear more fully under the "why."

c. When? Now that we have the subject and predicate, "He will convince," our first and very important, and inquisitive adjunct steps to the front and demands: When will he do this convincing? The answer is in the text: "When he is come," or having come he will convince, etc. But when will he come? "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send him unto you," verse 7. Then he cannot come till after Jesus goes away, which places this "convincing" after the ascension. But what wait they for? "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high," Luke 24:49. But when may they look for that power? "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you," Acts 1:8. Then the power is connected with the coming of the Holy Spirit. And when shall we look for that? "But ye shall be bap-

tized with [*εἰ, in*] the Holy Spirit not many days hence," Acts 1:5. Now the time is approaching, and we are within ten days of it. The risen Jesus had now been with them forty days, and after this interview he is "taken up." We now step forward ten days to the Pentecost, or fiftieth day from the resurrection. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come * * * * they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance," Acts 2:1-4. Now the Spirit has come, and has conferred on them the power they were waiting for, and every restraint is removed, and every "until" taken out of the way. As he was to do the convincing when he came, and he came on the first Pentecost after the resurrection, clearly this convincing was to be done on that day, beyond all peradventure; and the record of the events of that day will show its fulfilment.

d. *Where?* Now that the "when" is settled, the "where" will almost settle itself, for in the passage in which he tells them to wait for the Spirit and power, and to first commence preaching remission in his name, he also tells them *where* to wait—at *Jerusalem*. See Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:4-8, and 2:1-4. And they were waiting at Jerusalem when the spirit came, and did commence that day and there.

e. *With what aids?* What a question, you say. As if the Holy Spirit needed aid in doing this convincing! Never mind what the Holy Spirit *needs* or what he *can* do without aid. I promised to let the Savior answer all these questions. So listen to his answer: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of [*περι, concerning*] me. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning," Jno. 15:26-27. Here the testimony is *concerning Jesus*, and is clearly *with the aid of the apostles*. "And ye are witnesses of these things," Luke 24:48; "And ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth," Acts 1:8. And that is just the order in which their testimony as witnesses for Jesus did go out. According to the Savior's own statement then, the spirit was to *testify*, and do this convincing, with the aid of the apostles. He was to testify, and they "also" were to testify.

f. Why? This question is answered in the 9th, 10th, and 11th verses. As there are *three things* of which he is to convince the world, so there are *three whys* in the answer.

1st. "Of sin, because they believe not on me," verse 9. Here the Spirit, with the aid of the apostles, is to present the testimony to convince the world of the *sin* of unbelief, in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, as the Spirit was to testify *concerning Jesus*, and the apostles were *also* to testify and be *his* witnesses.

2d. "Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more," verse 10. Not of *men* but of *Jesus*, is this justification predicated, because *I*, the one to be justified, go away and ye see me no more. The concurrent testimony is to convince the world of the justification of *Jesus* from the charge on which he was condemned by the Sanhedrim, and at the bar of Pilate. Having been condemned as an impostor by the highest Ecclesiastical tribunal on earth, and at the bar of the highest civil court condemned to death, and executed, Jesus, after his resurrection, ascends to heaven, and carries an appeal from the decision of the court below, to the Supreme court of the Universe. His appeal is sustained, and he stands justified in full from the iniquitous charge, and the justification placed on record in the archives of heaven, by the recording angel, clerk of the Supreme court of the Universe. But as the other witnesses, the apostles, can not go into heaven to examine the record, and Jesus goes away, and they "see him no more," and can not, as original witnesses, testify to that fact, the concurrent testimony of the Spirit is required; and from the court of heaven, the Holy Spirit is dispatched, as a swift-winged messenger, to bear the news to earth, and convince the world of his justification.

3d. "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged," verse 11. This is not a judgment *to come*, as we sometimes hear it quoted, but a judgment that had then been rendered. The prince of this world *is judged*, or *has been judged*. The appeal from the judgment of the court below had been sustained and the judgment reversed, and thus the prince of the world had been judged, when the Spirit came down on the day of Pentecost, and brought the testimony to "convince the world of judgment." All this the savior foretold to his apostles.

g. How? Here we enter the disputed territory. Some have

assumed that the Holy Spirit enters the hearts of sinners, and abstractly and immediately, that is, independent of instrumentalities, does this testifying and convincing; but is this even a necessary inference? It is not safe to jump at conclusions. How then is this convincing to be done, mediately or immediately? If a man tells you that your neighbor, A., had cut down a lot of forest trees without an ax, you might question his veracity. But you question his knowledge, thus: Did you see him cut them down? No, sir. Did he tell you? He did not. Then how do you know? Neighbor B. told me that he had cut them down, and never said a word about an ax, and I inferred that he did it without an ax! Now would this be a necessary inference? You say, no, it would not; for the ax being the ordinary instrument for such work, the inference would be that he used the ax, unless it was otherwise distinctly stated. If the Savior had told the apostles that the Spirit would convince the world of sin, without telling them how it was to be done, would it be a necessary inference that it would do it abstractly? Certainly not. As language is the normal medium of communication between spirit and spirit, the inference should be, that language would be the medium used in giving the testimony to convince the world of these facts. But Jesus did not leave them to guess. He told them how; and inference is ruled out. Here we have it from his own lips:

First *How*. "Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth is come, he will guide you [the apostles] into all truth" [all *the* truth], verse 13.

Second *How*. "Whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." Verse 13.

Third *How*. "And he shall show you things to come." Verse 13.

Fourth *How*. "He shall glorify me." Verse 14.

Fifth *How*. "For he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." Verse 14.

Sixth *How*. "He shall testify of me." 15:26.

Seventh *How*. "And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." 15:27.

Eighth *How*. "He shall teach you [the apostles] all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." 14:26.

Here are eight "hows" given by the Savior himself. Surely that is enough to estop the wildest imagination from running off into inference for the *how*.

These facts and this testimony, were in the future when Jesus made the promise to his apostles, but were accomplished, all and singular, on the day of Pentecost.

II. FROM STANDPOINT SUBSEQUENT TO THE FACT.

Now turn to Acts 2:1-42, and see the accomplishment of all the testifying and convincing, to which the Savior had pledged the Holy Spirit, in the language of our text.

a. Verse 1. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord [unanimously] in one place."

Here we find the apostles at the designated place, Jerusalem, and waiting for the spirit and power Jesus had promised.

b. Verses 2-4. "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." Now the spirit has come as promised.

c. Verse 4. "And began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Now they have received the power from on high.

d. Verse 5. Jews, representative men from all nations, providentially assembled to witness the laying of the corner stone of the Church of Christ, are present.

e. Verses 6-12 "How hear we every man in our own tongue, &c." Here the representatives of many nationalities, admit that they hear their own vernacular dialects spoken understandingly by these illiterate Galileans.

f. Verse 13. Even skeptics witness the effects of the Spirit upon the speech of the apostles, but attribute it to the spirit of wine.

g. Verses 14-31. Now the Spirit is "guiding them into the truth;" and they are unfolding the significance of prophecy of a thousand years standing now made "more sure" (2 Pet. 1:19,) in its recent triumphant fulfilment.

h. Verse 32. "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." Now they are "bearing witness" also, or concurrent with the testimony of the Spirit.

i. Verses 33-35. "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, &c." The Spirit's testimony that day brought down from Heaven.

j. Verse 36. "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Now he has glorified Jesus, or testified to his glorification, as Jesus had said: "He shall glorify me."

k. Verse 37. "Now when they heard this, they were pierced in their heart, and said to Peter and to the rest of the apostles, men and brethren what shall we do?" Now they are *convinced* of the sin of rejecting Jesus, of his justification, and the judgment rendered in the court above. Righteousness and justification are translations of the same word in the Greek. As converted sinners they now inquire what they shall do.

l. Verses 38-40. "Then Peter said to them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." The Holy Spirit, through Peter, the whole college of apostles standing by and assenting, now for the first time on earth, makes known authoritatively, what convicted sinners shall do for remission of sins in the name of Jesus; and the oracle reads as quoted at the head of this paragraph. This is in strict accord with what Jesus had said to them in his commission: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke 24:47.)

m. Verse 41. "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized." Those that were convinced on that day complied with the terms of citizenship in the new kingdom, in which is enjoyed the remission of sins in the name of Jesus.

n. Verse 42. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Now they are in the enjoyment of the privileges and immunities of citizenship, and in the practice of Christian duties.

In view of these facts, well may Paul exclaim: "So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10:17)

Thus the Holy Spirit did, at Jerusalem, with the aid of the apostles, for reasons given, in manner described, on the appointed day, furnish the testimony to convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. And in like manner he continues to convince those who give earnest heed to his testimony, which has been "written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name." (John 20:31.) Let us not resist the Spirit by rejecting his testimony.

G. R. HAND.

THE ALLEGED CRUELITIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

There is no portion of Sacred History which unbelievers have more fiercely attacked, or in regard to which believers have been more seriously perplexed, than the accounts of Jewish wars of extermination. So long ago as the second century of our era, these wars were cited by Celsus in proof of inconsistency between the teaching of God, as represented in the Old Testament, and that of the Son of God, as represented in the New. With his usual vehemence, and his accustomed accuracy of information, this writer expresses himself as follows :

"If the prophets of the God of the Jews foretold that he who should come into the world would be the Son of this same God, how could he command them through Moses to gather wealth, to extend their dominion, to fill the earth, to put their enemies of every age to the sword, and to destroy them utterly, which indeed he himself did—as Moses says—threatening them, moreover, that if they did not obey his commands he would treat them as his avowed enemies; whilst, on the other hand, his Son, the man of Nazareth, promulgated laws quite opposed to these, declaring that no one can come to the Father who loves power, or riches, or glory; that men ought not to be more careful in providing food than the ravens; that they were to be less concerned about their raiment than the lilies; that from him who has given them one blow they should offer to receive another? Whether is it Moses or Jesus who teaches falsely? Did the Father, when he sent Jesus, forget the commands which he had given to Moses? Or did he change his mind, condemn his own law, and send forth a messenger with counter instructions?"—*Ante-Nicene Library, Origen against Celsus, VII, 18.*

The same objection, varying much in form but only slightly in substance, has been re-echoed along the ages, by the early English deists, by Voltaire, by the German rationalists, and by the most recent special pleaders against the Bible in our own generation.

There is no dispute in regard to the facts which furnish the ground of this objection; they are described in terms so unambiguous as to admit of no misunderstanding. The three wars which

are most conspicuous, and which may properly be made to stand the test for all the others, are those waged respectively against the Midianites, the Canaanites, and the Amalekites.

In the first, after the army of Israel had slain all the warriors whom they encountered in the land of Midian, they returned to the camp bringing all the women and children whom they had found, as captives. Moses, with the high-priest and the princes of Israel, went out to meet the victors, and when he saw the captives, he commanded that all the married women and the male children should be slain, but that the female children should be kept alive. The order was immediately executed, and the female children were distributed among the families of Israel as slaves.* The reason assigned for killing the married women was that they had enticed the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit whoredom with them in the worship of Baal-Peor, thereby causing the death by plague and by public execution, of more than 24000 Israelites.† The purpose of slaying the male children is not stated, but it is obvious from the nature of the case, that it was to exterminate the tribe of which they were the remnant.

In regard to the Canaanites, Israel was commanded to make no covenant with them, neither to let any of them dwell in the land; †† to smite them, utterly destroying them, and showing them no mercy; ‡ to have no pity for them, but to utterly destroy their name from under heaven. § This command was repeated again and again from the very first year of the wilderness wanderings to the last year, as if to impress Israel with the extreme importance of obeying it. They fell short of a complete execution of the divine decree, and the failure was marked against them as a sin for which they suffered much in subsequent generations. ¶

The war against the Amalekites is said to have been undertaken by Saul in a time of profound peace, and in obedience to an express command from God through the prophet requiring him to slay "both men and women, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." The reason given was, that God remembered what Amalek had done to Israel when he came out of Egypt; and this was more than 400 years previous. The execution was so nearly complete, that only one man and the best of the oxen and

*Num. 31:1-18; 27-30. †Ib. 16; 25:1-9. ††Ex. 23:32-33.

‡Deu. 7:2; § Ib. 16, 24. ¶ Judges 2:1-5 *et al.*

sheep were spared; and for sparing these it was decreed that the throne should be taken from the family of Saul and given to another. *

These are the wars against which skeptics have so long and so persistently objected. They are set forth in the Scriptures without apology or extenuation, and in the same spirit they must be defended, if defended at all. The sacred penmen evidently set them down without thought of any impropriety in them, and without the slightest anticipation that their propriety would ever be called in question. The issue made by Celsus is the true issue; are these facts consistent with the character of God as set forth in the New Testament? Celsus made no objection to the facts themselves; for they were not out of keeping with the military usages of his own age and country. He contented himself with the charge of inconsistency. Modern skeptics, accustomed to the milder usages of warfare among highly civilized nations, are shocked at the facts themselves, and hold that the passages which represent them as having been authorized by God must be regarded as false.

If these wars had been undertaken by the Israelites at their own option, with only a pretense of divine authority, there would be no justification for them. The people would rightly be regarded as savages, and the pretence of divine authority as a device of their leaders intended to stimulate their courage, to silence the voice of pity, and prevent all scruples of conscience while they were engaged in the bloody work. The claim that these wars were waged by the command of God has given rise to the controversy concerning them; it is this alone that can justify them; and on the ground of this claim, the question must be discussed.

The question at issue, is not, whether, the claim of divine authority is true, but whether the character of these wars is proof that it is not true. A discussion of the former question would require us to present the evidences of the inspiration of the Old Testament writers; the discussion of the latter requires us only to determine whether the claim that God commanded these wars to be waged is so contrary to the character of God as to prove that the claim, no matter how well it is supported by evidence, must be false. Our discussion then, must proceed on the ground assum-

*-9; 22-28. 1. Sam.15:1-3;

ed by the sacred writers, until, in the course of our comparison of the facts in the case with the character of God, we shall be forced to the decision that the claim is false.

If the approval of these wars is inconsistent with God's character, it must be because it implies wrong on his part either to the exterminated, or to the exterminators, or to both. If the former did not deserve extermination, the approval involves injustice to them. If the Israelites were morally debased by being made God's agents in the slaughter, wrong was done to them. If neither of these hypotheses is true, then the sacred writers may be believed, notwithstanding their representation that God authorized these wars. Let it also be understood, that we are inquiring as to the consistency of these things with God's character, not as that character may exist in our imagination, but as it is represented by the Son of God and his apostles. We take the character of God as represented in the New Testament for our standard, because this is confessedly the purest representation of it ever made among men, and if this representation is not correct we know not what God's character is.

We proceed now to ask, is it consistent with the character of God, that he should bring about the extermination of such tribes of men as the Midianites, the Canaanites and the Amalekites? This character is known partly by the attributes ascribed to him, and partly by what he has done. Only when his attributes are understood in the light of his deeds can his character be known. The New Testament represents him as a God of infinite love and of longsuffering mercy; yet it also represents him as a God of justice, who punishes incorrigible sinners with the utmost severity, sometimes in this world, universally in the world to come. More specifically, and more to the point of our present inquiry, it represents him as having brought a flood upon the whole world of the ungodly, sparing only eight persons, and as having overwhelmed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah with fire. In both instances there was an indiscriminate destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions. It represents him also as declaring his purpose to eventually destroy all the wicked who will be on the surface of the globe. That these representations of God are made in the New Testament is undeniable, and that they were made by Jesus himself is as certain as that we have a correct report of his personal

teaching. Our inquiry, then, has reference to the compatibility of the wars in question with this representation of the character of God.

If, upon examination of the character of the Midianites, Canaanites and Amalakites, we should ascertain that they were moral and God-fearing communities, we could not believe that God ordered their extermination. Neither could we believe it, if the ground on which the scriptures represent God as giving the order were inconsistent with the New Testament portraiture of his character. If, however, these communities are found to be deeply sunk in iniquity, as were the Sodomites and the antediluvians, and that the order for their extermination is based on this ground, this order or something equivalent, is the very thing that we should expect at the hands of God. This is precisely what we find to be the case. God is represented as giving to Moses, together with the order for the extermination of the Canaanites, the grounds on which it was issued. It was because they were habitually guilty of all manner of incest, men taking to wife their own daughters, sisters and mothers, as well as all other near kin; because adultery, sodomy, bestiality abounded among them; because they practiced idolatry to the extent of casting their own infant children into the fire as sacrifices to one of their favorite gods. On account of these things God declares that the very land itself "vomiteth out the inhabitants." *

The women of Midian who were slaughtered by the command of Moses, were specimens of the women of these tribes. They were the wives of the men of Midian and the mothers of their children; yet, without shame on their own part, and with the full approval of their husbands, they invited the men of Israel to the number of 2,400 to come and openly commit adultery with them. The base brutality of the deed makes it almost incredible, yet it receives a darker hue from the fact that it was done as an act of worship to their God Baal-peor; and that they invited the men of Israel rather than other men, because Balaam had told them that in this way they could bring down upon Israel that curse from the God of heaven which Balaam himself had vainly tried to invoke. †. Into what deeper degradation can human beings be sunk, when their very religion makes them worse than brutes and

* Lev. 18: 1-25. † Num. 25: 1-9; 31: 1, 2; 12 16.

fills them with helish malice. It seems more reasonable to doubt that a tribe of men could be thus debased, than that the God of purity should order the extermination of such a tribe. But that such a debasement was not uncommon among ancient Asiatics is well known to readers of ancient history. Among the Babylonians, every woman was required, once in her life to visit a shrine of one of the gods, and there remain until some stranger cast money into her lap and took her away with him. Herodotus who witnessed one of these assemblies, declares that even women of the wealthy classes, attended by retinues of servants, partook in this shameless procedure. *.

The Sodomites were a part of the population of Canaan, and inasmuch as Lot was vexed with their filthy conversation from day to day, we may presume that his two maiden daughters were the most decent women in the city, and that he himself had more regard than any other man there for female virtue. But the contaminating influence of their hellish society upon Lot, is seen in the infamous proposal which he made when the men of the city were burning to commit the crime which has been called sodomy from the name of the city; and upon his daughters, by their detestable crime with their father in the mountains of Moab. †. In the neighboring city of Jericho, at the time of the Israelite invasion, there was just one person good enough to be spared the slaughter which was visited upon the inhabitants, and she, though probably the best person in the city, was a harlot. ‡.

The character of these tribes in other respects was not more

* Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, vol. III, p. 30.

Rawlinson translates from Herodotus (I. 183) the following account of the scenes which he witnessed: "Many women of the wealthier sort, who are too proud to mix with the others, drive in covered carriages to the precinct, followed by a goodly train of attendants, and take their station. But the larger number seat themselves within the holy enclosure with wreaths of string about their heads, and here there is always a great crowd, some coming and others going. Lines of cord mark out paths in all directions among the women, and the strangers pass along them to make their choice. A woman who has once taken her seat is not allowed to return home till one of the strangers throws a silver coin into her lap, and takes her with him beyond the holy ground. When he throws the coin he says these words: "The goddess Beltis bless thee." The woman goes with the first man who throws her money, and rejects no one."

† Gen. 19:4-8, 30-38. ‡ Josh. 4:8-21; 6:22,25; Heb. 11:31; Jas. 2:25.

acceptable to God, than in reference to idolatry and lust. A single specimen, but doubtless a representative case, is placed before us in the book of Judges. It is that of Adoni-bezek the King of Jerusalem. This amiable gentleman amused himself by having seventy kings gathering crumbs under his table, with their thumbs and big toes cut off. *

In order to bring this matter a little nearer home, and to realize it more vividly, let us suppose that the Mormons on our border, in addition to their polygamy, were in the habit of taking their own daughters, sisters and mothers into the number of their wives; that sodomy and bestiality were practiced among them without rebuke; that they were idolaters, requiring every woman, in honor of their gods, to give herself periodically to the embraces of strangers, and frequently practicing infanticide by casting their children alive into furnaces of fire. Suppose that their leader were given to predatory wars upon the Indian tribes, and to the amusement of chopping off the thumbs and toes of his captives, and compelling them to gather crumbs under his table. Suppose, that through a strange infatuation many of our sons and daughters were being seduced by their influence into the same practices; and then let us ask ourselves how we would regard the question of exterminating such a set of brutes. I am inclined to think that we would not wait for the Lord to command us to draw the sword against them. If there were any hesitation about cleansing the earth of their presence, through reverence for the God who made them, the very infidels who now deny that God could have ordered the destruction of the Canaanites, would point to the continued existence of these people as proof that there cannot be a God of justice reigning over men. Thus, when we take that nearer view of the case, which alone can show some objects in their true colors, we are surprised not that God destroyed the Canaanites, but that he did not destroy them sooner.

There is only one ground on which a philanthropist can doubt the wisdom, and even the mercy of exterminating such a people; and that is, the possibility of their being reclaimed in a subsequent generation. It is a fact established by history, that some tribes of men can be elevated in the course of a few generations from very deep degradation into a state of civilization; and it is equally well established that some have sunk so low that extirpation is their

* Judges 1:6-7.

inevitable fate. Now God alone can know when a tribe has reached that bottomless pit of sin and corruption out of which no future generation of their offspring can be lifted, and for this reason he alone can decide when a tribe should be exterminated. He formed such a decision in regard to the tribes in question, and this was revealed to Israel as one of the grounds of his procedure. When God first entered into covenant with Abraham to give to his posterity the land occupied by these tribes, he gave as a reason why this transfer, involving the slaughter of which we are speaking, should not be made till four hundred years should have passed away, that "The iniquity of the Amarite is not yet full." It had not yet reached that fullness which demands extermination; but God foresaw that this point would be reached in four hundred years. *. That portion of them who occupied the cities of the Jordan plain reached this culminating point before Abraham's death, and he was a witness of their extermination by fire and brimstone. The others, not profiting by this warning, continued to grow worse until the days of Joshua, when the order for their destruction was issued. While the slaughter was in progress God saw to it that none should flee and escape; for we are told that "It was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favor, but that he might destroy them as the Lord commanded Moses."

We have now presented the case of these tribes as it stands on the pages of the Bible. If any reader still doubts whether God could consistently order their extermination, he should also doubt, whether God could consistently have destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, as the ante-diluvian world. If any one shall answer, that he does doubt these latter facts, I then point him to some facts that he cannot doubt. He cannot doubt that the ancient Chaldeans, Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, and many other once powerful tribes of men have been exterminated. He knows that the same fate has befallen the semi-civilized tribes who once inhabited large districts of both North and South America. By whose order was this work effected? Not by any revealed command of God, most assuredly; yet if there is a God ruling over the affairs of men, it was done because he saw fit to see it done without interference;

* Gen. 15:13-16; 18-21.

and it is certain, that had he desired the continued existence of these tribes, he would have ruled otherwise. Had he not, indeed, desired their extermination, he would have secured their protection. As sure, then, as there is a God in heaven, he has providentially brought about by the instrumentality of man, the extermination of some tribes of men; and as sure as he has done this, the extermination of tribes, hopelessly sunk in iniquity, is in harmony with his character. The first branch of our inquiry here terminates.

Seeing that the extermination of the tribes in question was in itself not a wrong on God's part, but one of many judgments of the kind which he has executed, we next inquire whether a wrong was done to the Israelites in making them the executioners of God's righteous judgment.

That aggressive warfare, under ordinary circumstances, is base in itself, and has a debasing effect on those who participate in it, is universally acknowledged. It may be doubted, indeed, whether a highly enlightened people can engage in even a defensive war, without serious corruption of their morals. At the same time there are some states of society in which warfare, without making men worse in some particulars wherein they are already bad, may in other respects have an elevating tendency. But the wars in question were unique, according to the representation of them on which we are arguing, in that they were waged by the express command of God. True, this representation is called in question, but, as we have said before, the issue is not whether this representation is true, but whether the nature of the wars is proof that it cannot be true.

If the inevitable effect, or the actual effect on the Israelites, had been to render them revengeful, or cruel, the objection of the unbeliever would appear to be sustained, unless, notwithstanding this effect, there had also resulted some greatly preponderating good, which, by counterbalancing the evil would have rendered the aggregate effect a good one. We can ascertain how this was in the actual case before us, only by a careful examination of the facts in the light of human experience. To wage war for the avenging of injuries, or for the mere love of conquest, must necessarily render men revengeful and cruel; but must these effects follow from a warfare undertaken, not to avenge a wrong, not to gratify malice, not for love of conquest or of gain, but because of an express command from God himself and in the absence of all the motives which

ordinarily prompt nations to make war upon one another? This is the question now before us, because this is precisely the case of Israel. They had no quarrel with the Canaanites to avenge; with the Midianites they had participated in sinful pleasures for which both parties were punished; and though, in the case of the Amalekites, God remembered what they had done to Israel more than four hundred years previous, Israel had entirely forgotten it, or remembered it without resentment. They desired the land of the Canaanites, but rather than fight for it they had preferred returning to Egypt.* Not one of the motives which ordinarily incite nations to war can be detected in Israel. They appear at every step in their approach to Canaan, and at every stage in the progress of the war, to be a mass moved by no impulse from within, but impelled by a power without and above themselves. The pillar of cloud which led them symbolized the only power by which they can have been moved to either begin or continue the war. In fact, whenever we find them acting from their own impulses, the movement is in the opposite direction. It is seen in their flight before the men of Ai; their fearful trepidation over this defeat; their hasty conclusion of a treaty with the Gibeonites; and their actual cessation of hostilities when as yet their task was not completed, a remnant of the natives being left in the land in spite of all the remonstrances of Joshua and other prophets.† In the cases of the Midianites and the Amalekites, their human impulses led them in the same direction, causing them to spare some who were doomed to destruction. These facts are inconsistent with the supposition that the Israelites were rendered more cruel or revengeful by the prosecution of these wars. On the contrary, their freedom from these passions is evinced by their falling short of the divine command.

A further proof that the effect in question was not produced, is seen in the fact that ever afterward, with all the sins and follies of the twelve tribes, they were characterized by less cruelty in warfare than surrounding nations. The kings of Israel, even in the time of Ahab, the wickedest of them all, were regarded by neighboring nations as "merciful kings," and Ahab was himself rebuked by a prophet for sparing a defeated enemy who had taken advan-

* Num. 14:1-4. † Josh. 7:2-9; 9:14, 15; Judges 2:1-5.

tage of his mercy.* As an actual fact, then, the Israelites were not rendered cruel or revengeful by the wars which they waged under the command of God.

An apparent objection to this conclusion might be found in the revengeful sentiments expressed in a few of the Psalms.† It is quite certain that such sentiments could not be entertained by men imbued with the spirit of the New Testament; for the very possession of this spirit excludes such sentiments from the heart. But while it is a fact that such sentiments were entertained without a sense of wrong by the Israelites, it is still an open question whether these sentiments were created within them by the events of their history. If they were inspired by the wars of which we have been treating, then the God who commanded them to wage these wars is responsible: but if they existed naturally in the Psalmist, they prove, not that Jewish wars had an evil effect on the Jewish heart, but only that the Jewish system of religion failed to subdue within the Jewish heart one of its natural passions. It argues a defect in Judaism as compared with Christianity, but not a fault. That this is the truth in the case, is, I think, quite obvious; for although we have but little information concerning the national sentiments of the Israelites in this respect previous to the commencement of the wars under Moses and Joshua, we have no reason to doubt that they were the sentiments common among the nations of that age. They were the very sentiments expressed in the Psalms above referred to.

We must not fail, in this connection, to notice another fact which throws in a different light the system of moral discipline established in Israel. While David, the author of some of the sentiments in question, entertained these sentiments and acted on them in regard to his enemies in general, at the same time he was taught to exercise in a particular direction the very forbearance toward enemies which is inculcated in the New Testament. No man ever did or could more implicitly obey the precept, "Resist not evil," nor more effectively return good for evil and thus heap coals of fire on the head of an enemy, than David did in his dealings with Saul.‡ Although the Jewish system, then, did not eradicate all hatred of enemies from the hearts of its pious subjects, but rather

* I Kings 20:31, 42-43. † See for example, Ps. 109:1-20; 139:20-22.

‡ I Sam'l 24 and 26.

left them as they were in regard to their heathen enemies, it did lift them up even to the Christian standard in regard to a certain class of enemies, those who were the "Lord's anointed."* It thus prepared the way for that better dispensation in which all men are the Lord's anointed in so far as to be protected by the express command of God from hatred and violence.

Nor is this the only good effect of the system of discipline which we are considering; for as an executioner, who is compelled by the duties of his office to hang or behead criminals against whom he has no personal quarrel, instinctively learns to abhor the crimes for which they suffer, so the Israelites, by being required, with their own hands and against their natural inclinations, to exterminate certain tribes of men for their crimes against God, learned to abhor these crimes. Their natural disposition led them to readily adopt the wicked practices which were established as the customs of their age, and they needed just such experience as was imposed upon them in these bloody wars, to correct this tendency. For this view of the case we have the authority of God himself as reported by Moses; for in the very communication which conveyed the purpose of God in causing the land to vomit out her inhabitants, he warns Israel against repeating the crimes for which these tribes were to suffer, and says to them, "Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations, neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you, that the land spue not you out also, when you defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you."† It was found necessary to repeat this lesson again and again, and to add to it others of a different kind ere the Jewish people became fixed and unmovable as a monotheistic and moral nation, and had it not been for this discipline the world would not have been prepared for the better and purer system revealed through Jesus Christ.

If in the mind of any reader there still lingers the objection, that after all that has been said, the Old Testament represents God as sanctioning an imperfect system of morals, it must be answered that this is what Jesus himself represents him as having done. Indeed, the entire system of morality and religion set forth in the

* I Sam'l 24 and 26. † Lev. 18:1-5; 25-28.

New Testament assumes the imperfection of that in the Old. This is taught in passages so numerous and so familiar, that I need not cite them. The fact, then, instead of presenting an inconsistency between the Old Testament and the New, is itself an essential part of that gradual revelation of God to men, and that gradual elevation of man out of the corruption into which he sank as a result of the fall, which distinguishes the system of religion found in the Bible from all other systems. If to any one it may appear unwise in God to pursue a progressive course like this, a more careful study of the subject in the light of possible alternatives, may lead him to see that in this, as in some other particulars, the foolishness of God is wiser than men.

There is still another point of view from which a question might be raised in regard to the ill effects of Jewish wars of extermination. We have seen that they involved no wrong to the exterminated or exterminators, and that they worked some good to the latter; let us now inquire as to their effect on other nations who have been cognizant of these events. Has the example of the Israelites encouraged other nations to undertake similar wars? We may not be able to answer this question with confidence, but we can with certainty say this much, that no nation can have been encouraged by this example to undertake such wars without a gross misconception of the example itself. It is the example of a nation engaging in war, not to avenge its own wrongs, not to gratify its own lusts, but simply to obey the revealed will of God. Such an example can never be rightly pleaded as an excuse for any war not undertaken in obedience to a divine command equally explicit. No nation therefore can ever have rightly excused herself for any manner of warfare by this example, seeing that no nation but Israel has ever received that divine commission which was the only justifying cause of the Jewish wars. Thus the matter stands in respect to the example of Israel. As respects that of the exterminated tribes, it is easy to see that their fate has served as a solemn warning to all tribes of men against falling into that state of moral degradation which demanded at the hands of God their extermination. The restraining influence of the fate of these tribes, like that of the fate of the Sodomites and the ante-diluvians, has been so constant, so widespread, and so long continued, that any attempt to estimate its force would be vain.

We are now prepared for still another question which must often arise in the minds of thoughtful persons. Seeing that God had the alternative of destroying the tribes in question by fire and water, as he did the Sodomites and the ante-diluvians, why did he choose to employ the hands of the Israelites, and thus present the awful spectacle of one tribe of men exterminating another tribe? This question goes beyond the issue which we have discussed in this essay; for, if what we have already said is correct, these wars are not so inconsistent with the character of God as to prove that the books which accredit them to God's command must be false; and this conclusion stands good even if we confess our inability to give a reason why the work of extermination was not effected in some other way. But we do not despair of vindicating the choice which God made.

It is impossible to appreciate God's dealings with ancient Israel, unless we keep in view the educational purpose which ran through it all, and which is so frequently emphasized by the apostle Paul.* We have just seen that these wars had an educational effect on Israel, and that they have taught the other nations the fatal effects of national degradation; but they accomplished other most important results which could be accomplished through no other method of extermination. At that period the power of national gods was estimated by the victories which their worshipers achieved, and every god was the god of some nation. This made it necessary, if the true God would force the world into renewed knowledge of himself, that he should appear as the God of some nation; that he should enable that nation to achieve victories beyond the power of others; and that he should make it indisputable that the victories were wrought by his hand rather than by the superior natural strength of his people. Such was the declared purpose of the plagues of Egypt, and the deliverance of Israel from their bondage in that country. Jethro saw these events in their true light, when, having listened to the account of them, he exclaimed: "Now I know that Jehovah is greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly he was above them."† The victories achieved east of the Jordan carried the same conviction to the minds of the Canaanites, rendering their stubborn resist-

* See 1 Cor. 10:6, 11; † Ex. 6:5, 7; 7:45; 9:16; 18:11.

ance inexcusable;* and when they heard of the passage of the Jordan, their hearts for a time melted within them. The miraculous fall of Jericho, and the obedience of the sun and moon to Joshua during the battle of Gibeon, were intended for the same purpose. These events made it unquestionable that Israel's victories were due to the power of Israel's God, and that Israel's God was above all gods. The lesson was intended especially for the instruction of surrounding nations, and we have conclusive evidence that it was not lost on them, for after some centuries had passed away, the Philistine army being in array against Israel, on seeing the ark of God brought into the camp of Israel, exclaimed: "Woe unto us! for there hath not been such a thing heretofore. Woe unto us! who shall deliver us out of the hand of these mighty gods! These are the gods that smote the Egyptians with all the plagues in the wilderness."† The same design is brought to light in connection with Jewish wars of later date;‡ and no man can tell how great has been the power of these facts in the world's restoration to a knowledge of the true God.

While this general education of the world has been in progress, the individual saints of God in every subsequent age have continually drawn another lesson from the same source. It is impossible for the believer to watch the progress of the Israelites through all the dangers and conflicts of their heroic period, and behold how the arm of God was ever made bare in their defence, without feeling a more implicit trust in the protecting power of that same God against the machinations of spiritual foes. The parallel is so complete, that the struggles and triumphs of the Christian are expressed in the military terminology of the Old Testament, and the God who led the armies of Israel is still worshipped as "the God of hosts." Were the wars of the Jews blotted out from the history and poetry of the Old Testament, that book would suffer in all its parts, the imagery of the New Testament would be robbed of its energy, and the Christian's trust in God would be less complete. Let us deprecate the thought of such a mutilation of God's book, and let us learn to look upon all of its parts in the light which they mutually shed upon one another; thus only will they appear in their true colors and reflect to our

* See the confession of Rahab, Josh. 2:10, 11. Josh. 5:1.

† 1 Sam. 4:7, 8. ‡ See for example, 1. Kings 20:28; 2 Kings 19:20-28.

minds the wisdom and the goodness of their author. A more profound study of the Bible itself, of the whole with reference to its parts, and of the parts with reference both to the whole and to one another, is the greatest need of this generation, and the best minds of the generation are waking up to a realization of this fact. May God increase the number, and thus hasten the vindication of his own good name as the author of the Book of Books.

J. W. McGARVEY.

INSPIRATION.

Christianity rests on the assumption that the Scriptures are inspired. I say Scriptures, allowing some margin to the investigator, because with some there is an opinion that *all* of the Bible is not inspired. All critics agree, however, in saying that *some* of the Bible is of Divine inspiration. I shall confine myself then to this part of the word, not pausing to inquire how much of it, nor where it may be found. There is such a thing as Scripture given by inspiration of God. Paul said so, and whether little or much, we here find agreement. Now, what is inspiration? and how is this Scripture inspired? Especially with the last question are we concerned. Here is one of the battle grounds of this skeptical age where we hear the roar of the heavy artillery. A failure here, one single compromise, will certainly lead to a Waterloo defeat. I will briefly notice what I take to be a fatal concession to the hosts of skepticism.

But first a definition of inspiration. Briefly, it is the communication of knowledge to a person to meet certain conditions. Divine inspiration then is the revelation of some truth or fact to an individual by a power divine. Some say this truth must be of such a nature that it could not otherwise have been obtained, but I question the position. When a person delivers a message which is not his own, but emanates from another source, he delivering it by dictation, that person is to all intents inspired. The apostles spoke in this manner. They were merely mediums of communication, instruments used by the Spirit in delivering the message of truth. The message was not their production but emanated from a superior source, hence they delivered it by inspiration. Peter says, "Holy men of God spake *as they were moved* by the Holy Ghost." Old version. Whatever the apostles spoke then as dictated by the Spirit may be safely claimed as of inspiration. Whether or not that embraces Paul's direction about the cloak at Troas let reason decide. And now, having defined inspiration, let me deflect for a moment before considering the second question, and drop a

thought about deciding what part of the word is inspired and what is not. Some people think it almost, if not quite, the unpardonable sin to say that any of the Testament, even a word, is not inspired. Others have advanced a little, slowly and cautiously, and with great humility suggest that Paul did not need inspiration to direct that his cloak be brought from Troas. They think possibly Paul might have known that he would need the cloak without waiting to be inspired. It looks reasonable, but they almost apologize for suggesting the idea. Now I say away with halting and hesitation. If part only of the word is inspired there should be found a plain, rational method by which to determine what is, and what is not, inspired. Is such a method attainable? I think so. The definition indicates it. Any language, precept or command, which the apostles *repeated* (mark the word) by the aid of the Spirit, is inspired. More, it is verbal inspiration as we shall presently demonstrate. Christ spake great truths to the disciples, essential truths, and afterwards, under the influence of the Comforter, these truths were remembered and reproduced. Evidently they were repeated exactly as spoken by the Lord which amounts to verbal inspiration. But of this by and by. Clearly then all the *language* attributed to Christ, such as commands, precepts, beatitudes, etc., must be considered inspired. These words of the Master are given us through inspiration. Of this there can be no question. Christ said of the Spirit, "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have *said unto you*." Here was the work of the Spirit—causing them to remember what He had *said* so they could exactly repeat his words. So much for this which clearly embraces in its scope the teachings of Christ and therefore all the doctrines enunciated by Him. But what of the historical portions of the four gospels, or narratives? Is this inspired? Is the history of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, in every word, genealogies and all, inspired? Here is dangerous ground some one may think. Very good. We will be very careful. I am in favor of having a view of inspiration worthy of the name, and to apply it to that part of the Word to which it clearly belongs. We want no wishy-washy theories, smothered in a profusion of apologies and glittering generalities. Let us face the problem boldly, and carefully examine the records.

Why did Luke write up his history? Did the Spirit direct

him to do so? Let us see. "For as much as many have taken in hand to set forth, etc., it *seemed good to me also*, having had *perfect understanding of all things from the first*, to write unto thee in order." Luke, 1:1-3. This will bear analysis. First, then, Luke says it seemed good *to me*, to Luke, to write. The conception then is due to Luke. Others had written, and feeling his own *ability* and resources, he concluded to write also. Thus it seems that the history was the result of a desire on the part of Luke, not as an act of obedience to a dictate of the Spirit. It seemed good to him to write, just as it seemed good to Bancroft to write a history of the United States. This much I said to a good brother some time since, a brother who ordained me to preach the gospel and in whose judgment I have great confidence. Said he: "Bro. M., you go too far. While the Spirit was to remind the apostles of what Christ *said*, it was also to lead them into all truth, and that gives us inspired history." But reflection shows this will not do. Look at our quotation again. If the Spirit dictated the work one person could write it as well as another under the influence of the Holy Comforter. If written by inspiration it would not be necessary for the writer to draw upon his own knowledge, the Spirit furnishing the particulars. But Luke says he "*had perfect understanding of all things from the first*," and gives that as a reason for his effort. Clearly then he wrote of his own knowledge, not depending on inspiration. If his history was an inspired effort why should he seek to commend it by advertising his own familiarity with the subject? This one statement of the book is clearly opposed to the idea of inspiration. This much with respect to the history of Luke as gleaned from his own preface. I presume it will be conceded that what is true of this gospel applies equally to the others. So far as their histories of Christ, in respect to His works and public acts, are concerned, we need not claim inspiration. This being conceded there arises no trouble in regard to chance expressions, mere verbal differences, upon which Infidels ring the old changes. Abbot, I believe, says that on the theory of verbal inspiration the differences of the writers are irreconcilable. Some to avoid this take the view that the writing is not inspired verbally. See Burgess and Underwood debate. Also Ditzler and Jameson discussion. A great many critics, unable to meet Infidelity at this point, are making the same disastrous concession. The Word is

inspired, but it is not verbal inspiration. It makes me think of that great dream—"I had a dream which was *not all a dream*." These critics have an inspiration which is so unworthy of the name that I conclude it is not inspiration at all. Your cool-headed skeptic laughs in his sleeve when the Christian scholar renounces verbal inspiration. It is a good concession. The Word is no longer Divine. It contains the Divine idea, but it is humanly expressed. The Spirit is good enough to let the apostles select appropriate words to express the truth—hence to that extent it is human. Whether the Spirit was deficient in language and therefore had to submit the orthography and etymology to the apostles is not stated, but the skeptic rejoices in any case. It is one step toward removing the Spirit, the Divine, from the word. One step farther and even this poor remnant, this miserable, beggared apology called inspiration, will be relegated to the realms of myths.

We conclude then that it is better to draw a line, and over on the one side place that which is distinctly human—the history, the record of events, the account of journeys and every-day transactions—and on the other, place that which is strictly Divine—the commission, the commandments, the promises, the sermon on the mount and the one delivered on the day of Pentecost. On the one hand humanity, with its differing modes of thought and expression. On the other hand Inspiration worthy of the name, giving us *verbatim* the truths SPOKEN by Christ and the Spirit. The line here indicated may easily be followed out to the end in the light of our definition. The distinctions which I have not space to point out now may readily be noted by the intelligent reader. I would not be dogmatic, but I ask careful examination of the Word in the light of this view. It may prove profitable and lead to a greater unfoldment of the truth. The conclusion arrived at here, while it may appear to some as speculative, has nevertheless removed not a few difficulties, and is at the same time free from anything like a concession to Infidelity, such as that involved in the surrender of verbal inspiration.

I wish now, in a brief manner, to present a few thoughts in favor of a verbal inspiration. I am not deterred from the task, either, by the reflection that many eminent critics hold adverse views, and that quite recently, even, an article in the *North American Review* by Miss Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, who is supposed to

have voiced the present progressive sentiment, denies that "progressive Christian scholarship" holds the dogma of verbal inspiration. In the face of this strong pronunciamento, hailing from Andover, and making its appearance in so respectable a journal as the *North American Review*, I must nevertheless enter a protest.

(1.) It seems rational to conclude that the Spirit, in bringing to the remembrance of the apostles their Master's words, would, in reminding them of His sayings, restore them *verbatim*. It is presumptuous to say that the apostles could improve the language of Christ's grand expressions—that they could select words more beautiful and appropriate than could Jesus. Inspiration enabled them to reproduce and rehearse Christ's exact words, not to imitate or improve. The Savior said, "The words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life." Who shall mar the beauty of that grand thought by saying the apostles revised and improved them? Rather than truckle so far to Infidelity I will renounce the whole claim of inspiration. We, who have attached so much importance to the Word, should be careful as to how we yield the claims of verbal inspiration. Dr. Graves, in his great debate with Dr. Ditzler, says in substance of the word βαπτίζω: "The Holy Spirit selected, out of many, that one word to express this great condition." I say amen. But if the Spirit selected the word, it was not left to the apostles to choose a word of such magnitude and importance in the salvation of the world. Pede-Baptist critics should catch this "progressive" straw, and, as the apostles expressed the truth in their own phraseology, renounce baptism on the ground that they failed to use the true word. It is an insult to the Spirit to set up the claim that it did not select and adopt the exact words of the great salvation. I hardly know how to criticise properly such a belittling estimate of the salvation which was at first "spoken" (and spoken rightly) by the Lord himself. This concession not only opens the flood-gate for the in-coming tide of sectarian heresies and speculations, but prepares a seat at the altar for the worst forms of Infidelity. I write thus strongly because I have been face to face with the enemy. From Adventism I gravitated into the whirlpool of Atheism, and from thence I was rescued by a proper view of the word of truth. I value that truth—I cherish it as the very word of my Master.

(2.) The apostles spake as the Spirit gave them "utterance."

The Spirit not only gave them ideas but *utterance* also. What does that imply if not verbal inspiration? But see how this lame, and halt, and blind theory of inspiration would work on the day of Pentecost. The apostles, filled with the Spirit, began to speak *in other languages*. The people were amazed. Here were ignorant fishermen, unlettered and unlearned, talking in other languages than their own. Whatever might be the message it was intelligently delivered in language with which the apostles were not familiar. How was this? Imagine, if you can, the Spirit giving them the ideas, and then Peter, with the eleven, choosing his own forms of expression in a language of which he was totally ignorant! "Progressive Christian scholarship" may equal the task. I acknowledge my impotence to even "progress," or "develop," in that direction. I confess that nothing but verbal inspiration seems to meet the case from my standpoint. This view seems to agree with Christ's words to the disciples. "Take no thought *how*, or what ye shall speak. * * * For it is not ye that *speak* but the Spirit of your Father *which speaketh in you*." Christ told them to not only take no thought of *what* they should say, but of *how* they should say it. The somewhat arduous duty of reconciling this with the "progressive" view of inspiration which has "developed" in these shaky times I leave to others. I hope it will be done, and that it will be made plain that Peter and the eleven selected the right words, and "forms of expression," at the time they were preaching in a language they knew nothing about. As a people we have had considerable use for the Second of Acts, but it occurs to me that this is a new "development," which, in point of peculiarity at least, overshadows all the former steps of "progress." It certainly needs attention, and I bespeak for it a liberal consideration at the hands of the friends of progress. The language of Paul is worthy of consideration. "Which things we speak, *not in words by human wisdom*, but by the teachings of the Spirit." He says of his teaching, of his inspiration, that it is not only from the Spirit, but that the *words* are not the result of man's wisdom but are given by the Spirit. This Scripture, though an old text in the controversy, may appear in a new light in conjunction with what has gone before.

But I anticipate one objection. It is this: We have only a *translation* of the Word out of the original tongue, and as the

translators were not inspired, we have not at last a verbal inspiration. We have only a translation through a human source at last. Granting this to be true, there is an infinite difference between having the identical words of Christ given at the first by Divine inspiration, and in *not having them at all!* Those who reject verbal inspiration drive us to the conclusion that nobody but the few who actually heard Christ, or who were given the baptism of the Holy Ghost, ever had the exact words of the Savior. These few were so competent that they were permitted to amend and revise the ideas, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual," and thus give the world the truth in this manner. It thus appears that the apostles were the first revisers, and that the unfortunate people of that time instead of getting the Word of God were only treated to a revision, "the enticing words of man's wisdom." Hence the advocates of this theory are driven to the point, legitimately, that the world is, and always has been, without the Word of the Lord—that the New Testament is at best only a commentary. Peter was mistaken when he said "This is the word which by the gospel is preached." It was only a revision of the Word, a "form of expression" which he had "selected." Moreover the prophet should not have said, "The word of the Lord came to me," but, "I have received an idea from the Lord and choose this 'form of expression' to deliver it to you." This idea of translation will come with poor grace from those who have nothing from whence to start except a translation, or "form of expression" the result of human wisdom. How much better to say that the Divine requirements are couched in Divine language. A faithful translation, having the *exact words* of the Spirit to translate, will give us verbal inspiration, or its equivalent. Dr. Ditzler, in the Jamison discussion, as in others too, says "there can be no faithful translation." If that is true, there is little difference as to whether inspiration is verbal or not. Common people cannot get the Word in any case, because it can't be translated. Away with such nonsense. If the Spirit selected *one certain word* out of many, in one language, a word in a different language which *exactly represents* it, gives us verbal inspiration to all intents.

I submit this brief view of inspiration to the brotherhood. If it does not possess sufficient vitality to survive in the struggle for

existence let it go the way of all the earth. One virtue I claim for it—it is a perfectly honest view. It is not written to obtain for the author notoriety, but is submitted in the hope of doing good.

H. W. B. MYRICK.

THE NAME CHRISTIAN AND PRES. PENDLETON'S
ESSAY.

"BY WHAT NAME SHALL WE BE CALLED?"

[President Pendleton's Essay, "*By what name shall we be called?*" was chosen as the subject of a review in this paper, because it is decidedly the ablest defense of the common rendering of Acts XI:26, that had attracted our attention.

The present essay was intended to be written in a style purely affirmative, but upon mature deliberation, it was found, that the question was so involved in controversy, that it would be impossible to do justice to the subject, without calling up the criticisms adverse to our position, and as no one had given the opposing side, such an elaborate exposition, as our own President Pendleton, it became imperative that his essay should be chosen to represent the position opposed to the one herein advocated.

But the present essay is not meant merely as a *review*. It is intended to be as thorough an examination of this whole subject as it is possible for its author to produce. But whether in this, he has failed, or succeeded, is left for his readers to decide. The advance of Hellenistic philology, has long been with him, a great object of solicitude, and as every successive improvement in this department of knowledge, is effected by the quiet labors of humble specialists, he is emboldened to hope, that this contribution to Greek philology may not be useless to the devout student of sacred literature.]

I have just finished reading the paper above named. With a large portion of theis Essay, an unprejudiced mind cannot but be pleased, edified and delighted. The world moves! For that the name Disciple is not an adequate designation for the people of God, is now, not only conceded, but contended for in a decided, and almost exhaustive manner. The beggarly pseudonym, "Disciple Church," is ably exposed, and held up to deserved reprobation. "We no where meet with the "Saint Church," "Disciples' Church," nor "Church of Disciples."—*Moore's Christian Quarterly*, January, 1876, page 61. But this is not all. He pleads manfully for a *divinely* given name. Thus:

1. In names divinely given, there is always special signifi-

cance. And this, it is important for us to catch and keep. The name is a history, a doctrine, or a grace—a symbol, unlike a human creed, with a substance of God's thought in it, gathered up into a brief utterance, that we may write upon our hearts, and feel its significance. When Zachariah and Elizabeth brought the child of promise to be circumcised, it was not a matter of indifference, what name he should be called. They did not reason, that "by his father's name, he would be just as dear." But they remembered the scene at the altar of incense, and the command of the angel, that his name should be John. Thus far, and even farther, the Pres. is unquestionably sound.

2. He next goes on to try such scriptural appellations as "Disciples," "Saints," "Believers," and "Brethren." But all these, he finds too indefinite, for the general name of God's people. Then after examining such party names as Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian and sundry others, both scriptural and non-scriptural, he proceeds: "What shall we say then? Is there no name, which the scriptures use, that is at once significant of our essential character, and comprehensive enough to embrace all allowable diversities, and degrees of opinion and faith, and specific enough to limit the extent within the requisite conditions of evangelical fellowship? We think there is, and hesitate not to say, that it is the name Christian."

These are the well weighed words of our able President Pendleton. But who could believe after reading his plea for a divinely given name, and his argument against all others, and his unhesitating avowal, that the name "Christian" is possessed of a suitability, and comprehensiveness which carry it far in advance of every other, as a name for the Church, and people of God—that this same author should deny that this name was given by divine authority? Yet such is the case. And we have not been able to find, that he has not condemned "himself in the things he alloweth."

3. But it is worthy of our attention, to inquire what is gained by the denial, that God gave the name Christian? God gave names to Adam, Abraham, Israel, John and Jesus. The name of God's ancient people, denoted a people who had power with God. And the Hebrew word for God, was included in the name Israel, just as the name Christ is included in the name Christian. But if

God so carefully named his ancient people, that he bestowed his own name, or a part of theirs, is it probable that he would allow the the Church, Christ purchased with his own blood—the Church of which ancient Israel was but a type—to go unnamed, or to take one haphazard, or be content with a nickname? But how far the President will be inculcated in or justified from these intimations, will appear as we proceed. This hypothesis of denying any specific impartation of the Christian name, lays the axe at the root of the tree of Divine Revelation. The cause of unbelief is greatly strengthened by this position, for it makes the New Testament look greatly inferior to the Old, and the unbeliever can lay his hands on two important passages of Isaiah, both manifestly pointing to the reign of Christ, which were never yet realized. (Isaiah 62:2–8, and 65:15) So all that can be gained by this theory is that two of the most definite prophecies of Isaiah concerning Christ's kingdom, as independent of Judaism, have failed, and we are left to doubt whether any kingdom of Christ has ever yet existed. The cause of those, who contend for no kingdom, and no definite Church, is strongly sustained, by eliminating from this name this grand essential of Divinity.

But the President had a way of his own in disposing of these prophecies. It is a very fashionable way also, and no doubt very satisfactory to himself. It consists in supplying a sprinkle of ridicule, in place of a *douche* of argument. "The new name promised in Isaiah 62:2 is Hephzibah "my delight," and not as is fancifully assumed, the name Christian."

Now as the word of prophecy is sure and steadfast, it is incumbent upon our worthy Pres. to tell us without any fanciful assumption, when and where, any people were ever called Hephzibah? If our worthy President has the ambition, with which every faithful Disciple should be endowed, of upholding the truth of the Bible, it is his solemn duty to show us the "HEPHZIBAH." But of course this will never be attempted, yet it seems impossible, that a man of his learning, and talents, could mistake an appellative for a proper name. Hephzibah may be rendered in colloquial parlance "my darling," and had the President let his eye run down to the fifth verse, he could easily have seen the solution of the whole matter. "As a bridegroom rejoiceth over a bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee." Men deeply in love with their brides,

are very apt to use endearing appellatives, which it would be offensive to hear from any one else; so this Hebrew word is no name at all, but only a term of endearment. The gist of the prophesy is that these newly named people would be so near and dear to their Heavenly Father, that he could use such terms of endearment towards them, as married men address to the dearest object of their heart's affection.

We are "translated into the kingdom of God's *dear* son." Can there then be a name more dear to God, than the name of Christ? "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, that is above every name—not only in this world but also in that which is to come." So if there be under heaven, and among men, a name given, that must be peculiarly dear to the Almighty, it must be the name Christian, when worthily worn. For it contains the whole name of Christ, whose unspeakable worth, no angel has ever yet unfolded.

4. But before entering upon the criticism of this essay, it is but fair to state, that the President has the popular side of this question. That great violence has been done Acts 11:26 by nearly all modern translators, will become manifest to every critical reader, as this review proceeds. The President has secured to himself the almost unanimous vote of sectarian Christendom, by the adverse criticism he presents against the divinity of the Christian Name; and were it not, that in this review, a large amount of sheep's clothing will be stripped from the backs of critics, whom our worthy President has followed, his Essay should go unreviewed.

5. It is not hard to understand why there is such a wrong-headed unanimity among critics who have led public sentiment on this question for the last two hundred years. "The true sectary of whatever party is always inclined to correct the diction of the spirit by that of the party;" but this quotation is not intended for Pres. Pendleton, or indeed is it at all applicable to him, for the worthy appropriation of a divinely given name would justify our existence as a people; while the use of every unauthorized name is, to us, a greater reproach than it could be to any sect on earth; and while this name is a crown of glory to the true bride, it is a silent, but permanent condemnation to all religious organizations not worthily bearing this authorized name. Hence the long continued exertion among sectaries to keep its divine origin out of notice.

6. In this case, the President has done what every linguist is accustomed to do: he trusts to his lexicons; but it is the task undertaken in this review, to show that even lexicons sometimes need a rigid emendation.

7. But before we hear the President on Acts 11:26, we must attend to his notions of a God-given name. I shall doubtless be told, that he believes in the Divinity of that name as intensely as any of us. Has he not said, "in names divinely given, there is always a significance. And this, it is important for us to catch and keep. The name is a history, a doctrine, a grace," etc. Is it not therefore plain, that he firmly believes in a divinely given name? Indeed, it has such seeming; but where does he find the divinity of the Christian name? Is it in I Pet. 4:16. "If any suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God *in this name*." This, taken together with the proper understanding of Acts 11:26, is a grand subsidiary proof of such divinity; but take away Acts 11:26 and it is no proof at all. It looks very much like the climax of absurdity to claim divinity for this name from Peter, who says nothing about its divinity, and scout it from Acts 11:26 where its divine bestowal is distinctly affirmed, both by implication and affirmation. If it be a God-given name, this divinity must have been imparted to it when it was *first* received; which was at Antioch. To deny the agency of God in that transaction is to strip its origin of all pretensions of a spiritual nature.

I Pet. 4:16 has been explained thus: Let disciples live such consecrated lives, that God shall be glorified by them, even in wearing such an unpopular name as Christian.

Peter refers to "Christian" as the name the disciples were wearing, and under which they were suffering persecution; but he gives us no intimation how they came to be so called, and but for Acts 11:26 even our learned President would never have dreamed of its divinity.

8. We will now hear his criticisms on Acts 11:26.

"And the interpretation put upon *χρηματίζω* is not warranted by any authority of acknowledged repute among scholars." The interpretation here alluded to is, that this word, in its Biblical sense, conveys the notion of warning, oracle, or name from God. Thomson, one of the signers of the Declaration of American Independence, translated the whole Bible from the Greek. He has

generally been regarded as a very fine scholar, and he understood that the disciples were named Christians at Antioch by divine authority; and every translator of the New Testament of any repute, whether scholar or not, has not hesitated to incorporate the phrase "of God" as a part of this word's meaning in five out of eight instances of its occurrence in the New Testament, not counting the case under consideration. In Luke 2:26 and Heb. 12:25, the divine influence is fully implied. So we may claim seven examples out of eight, as decidedly in our favor. The lamented President James Shannon, whose transcendent abilities as a Greek linguist were well known among us for years, manfully combated the position of our Essayist; hence *ex-cathedra* intimidations, under such circumstances, are not in good taste.

Χρηματίζω occurs sixteen times in the Bible; but for the sake of argument, we count but fourteen, for one of these cases is exceptional, and the other is in controversy. Now, each one of these fourteen holds the notion of divine agency in the action of the verb; and there is but one exception to this in the whole Bible which our President can claim as a model by which to render Acts 11:26, so the question arises, whether we shall translate after the model of fourteen examples and consider this one an exception, or shall we consider this one case a model, and the fourteen cases exceptions? To ask such a question is to answer it.

9. But it is objected, that *χρηματίζω* is a very old word and has a great variety of meanings, both classical and Biblical. Liddell and Scott give the following classical definitions:

1. To carry on business, to have business especially in money matters (though this especial signification is confined to the middle voice.)

2. *To negotiate.*

3. *To hear, debate, and advise.*

4. *To give a decision, τὸ δικαστήριον, πάλιν χρηματίζει.*

5. To give an answer after deliberation.

6. To have dealings of any kind with, or stand in any relation to a person.

7. To do business for one's own profit: hence,

8. *To make money.*

9. *To hold conference* with another.

10. *To traffic in money, as a banker.*

11. To make money of any one; to get it from him by extortion.

12. To gain an advantage of one, vide *πλεονεκτεω*.

13. In later writers from Polyb. downwards the active voice of *χρηματιζω* has the signification *to take and bear a title or a name*.

These are all the classical meanings given by Liddell and Scott. But it must be remembered that their's is a classical lexicon, and it has omitted its Biblical use altogether. There is no doubt but the ancient Greeks used this word in all these significations, but it would make utter nonsense of the Scripture to apply any one of these definitions to every text where it is found in the Bible.

10. But its Biblical use is much more consistent. Now the only way that the true meaning of words in a foreign language can be discovered, is by substituting the supposed definition for the word in question. The true definition, in like construction, will always make sense; while a false one may sometimes seem to make sense, but is not always suitable. It is true different constructions may vary its signification, but such constructions must also abide the test of substitution. According to this well known canon, I suggest *declare* as the Biblical meaning of *χρηματιζω*. But before giving a list of examples, permit me to say, the word representing *χρηματιζω* will simply appear in *italics*.

Let us now begin with Jer. 25:2. "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, write all the words I *declare* unto you in a book."

When this word is predicated of the Lord, it should be rendered simply by *declare*. But when a prophet *chreematizes*, he makes such a declaration in the name of the Lord, or he delivers an oracle.

Jer. 26:2. "Stand in the hall of the Lord's house, and *declare in my name* to all the Jews, and to all that come to worship in the house of the Lord, all the words I have commanded you to *declare in my name*; thou shalt not omit a word."

Jer. 25:30. "Prophecy against them all these words, and say the Lord from on high *shall declare*; from his holy place he shall utter his voice; he shall *declare*, or pronounce a sentence against this place."

Jer. 29:23. "On account of the iniquity they committed in Jerusalem, they even corrupted the wives of their citizens, and *declared in my name*, a word which I commanded them not. I am even a witness saith the Lord."

Job 40:3. "Do you think that I *have been declared* slightly unjust, that thou mightest be conspicuously righteous?"

These examples from the Old Testament are enough to show how well *declare* fills the sense of *χρηματίζω*.

But here it is well to note, that these references apply to the Septuagint Greek, which varies somewhat from the English version. In chap. 6, verse 11, in the New Testament it is more frequently used in the passive voice. But no passive verb can exist, without the implication of the active voice.

But before examining the New Testament use of this word it may not be amiss to cite a few examples from authors contemporaneous with the apostles.

Let us begin with Diodorus Siculus, who lived in the Augustan age, and seemed to have used the colloquial Greek of his time. He says, *τοὺς Θεοὺς αὐτοῖς ταῦτα χρηματίζεναι*, i. e. That the gods had revealed, or declared these things unto them.—*Diod. Sic. 3.6.*

Josephus uses this word also in its current New Testament sense. In his history of the Sennacheribean invasion, he says: "And the prophet having done these things, and (*Chreematisantos auto tou theou*) God having given an oracle, (or make a declaration to him) it encouraged both him and the king, and the friends who were about him."—*Ant. Book 10:13.*

Josephus uses this word again in the same sense, on the occasion of Alexander's coming to take Jerusalem. Speaking of the high priest Jaddua, he says "He therefore ordained, that the people should make a supplication, and should join with him in offering sacrifice to God, whom he besought to protect that nation, and deliver them from the perils that were coming upon them. But when asleep after his sacrifice, God *revealed* to him by dreams (declared, or explained to him) that he should take courage, and adorn the city, and open the gates; that the rest should appear in white garments, but that he and the priests should meet the king in their legal vestments. Having arisen from sleep, he greatly rejoiced, and made known to all, *το χρηματισ θεν*, the *divine declaration* proclaimed to him in his dreams."

To *declare*, and to *reveal* have reciprocating definitions. They meet in such as these: "To make clear," "to disclose."

From the foregoing exhibit it is evident that the New Testa-

ment use of *κηρυτίζω* was not a barbarism in the apostolic age. It also shows very plainly, that "from Polybius downwards, the active voice" of this verb had not been monopolized in giving or in assuming names.

12. *Κηρυτίζω* makes its first appearance in the New Testament, in Matt. 2, 12 and 22. In both cases it is a passive participle, and is rendered *being warned of God*. When any one is warned, there is always an active agent to give the warning. That God was the agent here, there can be no doubt, but how the warning was given we are not informed, except it was in a dream, and whether it was a mere impression made upon his dreamy senses, or whether it was declared to him like it was to the high priest Jaddua, we are not informed, but the latter supposition is by far the more probable.

This word is four times, in the New Testament, rendered *warned*. Twice in Matt. 2:12, and 22; in Acts 10:22 and Heb. 11:7. In the latter cases the declaration, that made the warning, is very patent. So there is plainly a close relation between the words *declaration* and *warning*; much closer than between the classical definitions given by Liddell & Scott; for instance, "to carry on a business" bears a very loose connection with "standing in the relation of affinity to any one." So also, "to negotiate" need not imply "to make money by fraud."

Luke 2:26. "It was revealed to him by the Holy Spirit, that he should not see death, until he had seen the Lord's Christ." This revelation was a divine declaration.

Heb. 8:5. *καθὼς Μωϋσῆς κηρυμάτισται*, "as Moses was admonished of God when about to finish the Tabernacle, for see, saith he, that thou make everything according to the pattern shown thee in the Mount." Here the declaration contained in what God "says" is the *Chreematism*.

Heb. 11:7 "Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet," etc. By referring to Gen. 6:13, we can see that their warning of God was a very pointed declaration. "And God said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, I will destroy them with the earth."

Heb. 12:25. "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh, for if they escaped not, who refused him, who on earth, (*Chreematised*,

made declaration in the name of the Lord,) much more shall we not escape, etc."

We shall next attend to the verbal noun *χρηματισμός*. This word occurs but once in the New Testament, Rom. 11:4, and is translated "what saith the *answer* of God unto him?" By referring to I Kings 19:15—18, it is easy to see, that the 18th verse is a *declaration*, and not an answer. "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bended unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him." So a declaration becomes an answer to suit the whim of the translator.

13. Let us now come to the crucial argument. Acts 11:26, Barnabas brought Saul to Antioch. "And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled with the Church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." So reads our common version. But in this rendering, there are two sentences made of one. Thus entirely changing the construction, and leaving this last sentence without a governing word, in the absence of which it cannot be translated.

The true grammatical construction can now be exhibited. "It came to pass, that for a whole year they assembled with the Church, and taught much people, and *declared or pronounced* the disciples Christians first at Antioch." Here are three verbs all under the same governing word, and connected with copulative conjunctions, so that if Saul and Barnabas *met* with the Church, and taught, it was the same identical person who *χρηματίσαι* (*declared or pronounced*), discipled Christians.

But their allegation shall introduce the President's rebutting argument, which it would be unfair to overlook.

He says, "It is true *χρηματίσαι* is the first aorist active, but in the first place, it is not in construction with *αυτους* "they," that is Paul and Barnabas; whatever *χρηματίσαι* may mean, it expresses no action of these persons. *Συναχθῆναι* "they assembled, and *διδάξαι* "taught," are both in agreement with *αυτοις* "they" meaning Paul and Barnabas, as is shown by their close connection, by the conjunction *και* "and." But the *και* is not repeated before *χρηματίσαι*. On the contrary *χρηματίσαι* is followed by the enclitic *τε*, which introduces an additional clause, and refers it back to *ἐγένετο* "it came to pass." So that the verse means literally, not only that it came to pass that

they, Paul and Barnabas met with the Church, and taught much people, but that it came to pass in addition to this $\tau\epsilon$ "that" the disciples were called, etc. It is clear therefore that Paul and Barnabas did not impose the name."

The lamented A. Campbell once said a Greek particle was a very slender foundation upon which to build a theory, but this particle $\tau\epsilon$ is the most slender of them all, and yet upon this feeble particle the President builds his paradoxical position, that the divinely given name, Christian, was not given by divine authority! Or at least, the time and place, when and where, it was so given, are reckoned with the secret things, which God has not revealed.

14. That he thus builds upon this particle $\tau\epsilon$, is plainly conceded, when he admits that if $\kappa\alpha\iota$ had been repeated, it would have proved that Paul and Barnabas had conferred the name. This seems immensely fair. But what will our President say, when it is proved, that when $\tau\epsilon$ follows $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the New Testament, it has the exact sense of $\chi\alpha\iota$ repeated?

To the proof of this allegation, some twelve examples shall be called from the New Testament.

1. Matt. 28:12. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) when they had assembled with the elders, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) had taken counsel, etc.

2. Mark 15:36. "One ran $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) filled a sponge with vinegar, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) putting it upon a reed gave him to drink."

3. Acts 2:3. " $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) it sat upon each one of them."

4. Acts 6:7. " $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) the number of the disciples was greatly multiplied in Jerusalem, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) a great multitude of the priests became obedient to the faith."

5. Acts 9:15. "To bear my name before the Gentiles, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) kings, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) the children of Israel."

6. Acts 9:18. " $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) he received sight forthwith, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) having arisen he was baptized." If this latter $\kappa\alpha\iota$ had been τ , what a beautiful example, it would have been of that "looser" connection!

7. Acts 24:5. "For we have found this man, a pestilent fellow, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (and) a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes.

8. Acts 26:10. "Which thing I also did in Jerusalem, $\kappa\alpha\iota$

(and) many of the saints I shut up in prison (having received authority from the chief priests) $\tau\epsilon$ (and) when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them."

9. Acts 26:11. Kai (and) punishing them often in all the synagogues, I compelled them to blaspheme, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even to strange cities."

10. Acts 26:20. "But shewed first unto them of Damascus, kai (and) at Jerusalem $\tau\epsilon$ (and) throughout all the coasts of Judea."

11. Heb. 1:3. "Who being the brightness of his glory, kai (and) the express image of his person, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) upholding all things by the word of his power."

12. Rom. 16. "Now to him that is able to establish you according to my gospel, kai (and) the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of this mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but is now made manifest, $\tau\epsilon$ (and) by the scripture of the prophets," etc.

Now here are twelve examples of $\tau\epsilon$ following kai , and in every case it has no less power than its precursor kai . Nor can there be found an example in the Greek Testament which will justify the President's construction of Acts 11:26.

Robinson's Lexicon says of this word, "so that strictly speaking kai connects, and $\tau\epsilon$ annexes, the former is conjunctive, the latter adjunctive. Hence $\tau\epsilon$ is the most general of all the copulatives; serving merely to show that the word, after which it stands, is to be taken as in some connection with another, either preceding or following."

Now the above is quoted because it has been hypothecated as authority for the change of construction contended for in the President's theory; but surely so general and feeble a word could hardly have the power to arrest a uniform process of grammar—where three verbs, all of the same mood and tense, and all under the same government—could hardly, I say, snatch one of these from its fellows and consign it to another subject.

15. But this is not all: If $\tau\epsilon$ shows "some relation to something going before or following after," such relation must be either grammatical, or logical. But it is difficult to see any logical connection between the Apostles' meeting with the Church, and teach-

ing, and the disciples independently taking a nickname!

But if it be a grammatical relation, the most natural construction is to let *τε* continue the conjunctive force of *χαλ*, as it always does in similar constructions in the New Testament. But surely Robinson's remarks can never justify the abnormal violence done to this text by wresting one of its principal verbs from its natural grammatical relation.

But again, this particle is twice a scape-goat. In the first place, it is too feeble to continue the ordinary copulative relation of a common sentence; then suddenly it becomes so potential as to reach its tentaculæ over two lengthy intervening clauses, so as to reconnect its dependent verb with the initial governing word of the sentence; from construction with which, this verb had just been severed by the impotency of this self-same *τε*!

16. The next thing in order is to attend to the President's definition of *χρηματίζω*. He inquires: "Did the disciples give it [the name] to themselves? Evidently not, in the strict sense of formally imposing upon themselves, or assuming a name. If Luke had intended this, he would have used quite a different expression and a different word. * * * * * Yet there is a sense in which they may be said to have given themselves this name, and it is on this account that we find this very peculiar and unusual word employed by Luke. *Chreematisoo* does not mean primarily, to call or name, at all. It means to carry on or transact a business so as to gain or get something thereby. The thing gotten will depend on the business, and the business becomes a calling; and by pursuing the calling one gets to be called by the name of the calling.

* * * This was precisely the case here. * * * It is remarkable how literally we now imitate this style of speaking in our usual, and we may say somewhat vulgar expressions in similar cases. Let one act in any extraordinary manner so as that his conduct forms a characteristic, and we say of him: "*He carries on so that he will get to be called this, that or the other name, whatever it may be, that expresses his peculiar habit. This is precisely the force of Chreematisai here.*" There is not the slightest relation between "carrying on a business," and the active voice of this verb being used passively "to be called, or to take a name." The only place in Scripture where this idiom is used, Rom. 7:3, the adulterer does not get that name by any peculiarity of behavior,

good or bad; but simply on the condition of an illegal marriage.

It is an odd freak of our common humanity to imitate a weakness against which we most declaim. After the President had so deftly disposed of the Prophecy of Isaiah, on the new name, by pronouncing it "fanciful," we could hardly help expecting great circumspection from him in this regard. But to believe that "*the Disciples carried on so*" as to get their name, is tenfold more fanciful than to believe Isaiah's prophecy was literally fulfilled at Antioch. Plutarch tells us of a people who *chreematize*, take their names, not from their fathers, but from their mothers. Did they *carry on so* that this had to be done?

The way the President speaks of "acknowledged repute among scholars," etc., he almost makes himself appear afraid to vary from the *dicta* of learned men, lest he should lose reputation among them. It ought to be consistent, both with manhood and scholarship, to take no man's word for anything we can verify for ourselves. Every new beginner in a foreign language has, of course, to rely upon his lexicon, because he can then do no better. But so soon as he can use the canon of criticism, upon which all lexicography is built, it is both his right and duty to do so; and if he fails to exercise that right when important issues are at stake, for fear of the frowns of a learned world, he does what none of the Martyrs dared do. Wickliffe, Jerome of Prague, Huss and Luther stood up against a world of as high *pretensions* as our own.

If from Polybius downward *χρηματίζω* in its active voice had no other meaning than *to take or receive a name*, the hasty violence done Acts 11:26, would be more pardonable; but when we know that both the Septuagint, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Paul and Luke use the active voice of this verb in a transitive sense, we can but wonder why this obvious construction is so readily thrown aside for one of rare occurrence and of difficult, if not impossible suitability.

If we take the active voice in its ordinary transitive sense, we have no difficulty with *τε*. It will just follow its uniform signification, as it does in all other similar collocations, throughout the New Testament; but so soon as we begin to make the construction of Acts 11:26 conform to that of Rom. 7:3, our first difficulty is with the conjunctions of the sentence, and to make *μαθητάς χρηματίζειν χριστιανούς* conform to *μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει* is simply an impossibility.

Μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει, is that celebrated idiom in which the active voice is used to mean *to take*, or *bear a title or a name*, always appears with but one express nominative. Of which idiom the above example is a perfect model; but there is no such example to be found as *Ῥαχὴλ χρηματίζει μοιχαλὶς*, *Rachel is called an adulteress*. This is good enough English, but is no Greek at all, and it is very wide of the idiom used in Rom. 7:3. But until some example analogous to the above be produced, there is no grammatical precedent for the common rendering of Acts 11:26. The construction forced upon this passage is "That the disciples *chreematized Christians* first at Antioch." Now if there be any example analogous to this in the idiom under consideration, a seven years' search has failed to discover it. But what renders the hope of finding such an example a forlorn expectation, is that the truly learned Robinson, in his valuable lexicon of the New Testament, has failed to find a parallel to Acts 11:26 in both citations made for that purpose. In both cases he manifestly thinks he has found a subject nominative expressed, so as to make it an example by which to render *μαθητὰς χρηματίζει χριστιανούς*. His citation from Jos. Ant. XIII, 11. 3. *Αριστοβουλος* is made the subject nominative to *χρηματίζας*, though ninety-nine words, and according to Whiston's translation, six complete sentences intervene between Aristobulus and *χρηματίζας*. Hence, it cannot be a parallel with Acts 11:26, where this theory understands *μαθητὰς* as subject, and *χριστιανούς* as predicate; a form this idiom was never known to take. For the subject and predicate are both included in the one single nominative: as in *μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει*. But who this *moichalis* is, can be easily found out by the logic of the connection; but in the Doctor's citation, it is not said that Aristobulus *chreematized* a "friend of the Greeks;" but that the "friend of the Greeks" *chreematized*, took this name, both as subject and predicate. But who this "friend of the Greeks" was, is not hard to find from the logic of the passage.

This idiom is hard to explain to a mere English scholar, for our language contains nothing analogous; but Robinson's quotation from Plutarch's Antonius is, in some respects, a still greater mistake. The ordinary English translation is "Cleopatra affected to give audiences to the people, in the name and character of the new Isis." Chamber's Encyclopedia gives it thus: "Cleopatra sat

and gave responses in the character of the youthful Isis."

While it is remarkable that neither of these translations justify the citations of Robinson's Lexicon, nor that of Liddell and Scott's, yet a more critical rendering would remove the text still further from the domain of the idiom they were seeking to illustrate. I therefore give the original Greek of this famous passage: *Cleopatra men gar kai tote kai ton allon kronon eis plethos ezionsa ieran stoleen isidos clambane kai nea Isis ekreematise.* i. e. For Cleopatra both *then* and *formerly* going out into a crowd, took a priestly garment of Isis, and *delivered oracles* as a new Isis.

That she did not have herself called a new Isis, as a permanent name or title, is plain from the fact of her act being qualified by "*them* and *formerly*." Delivering oracular responses in the character of a new Isis, and having herself called by that name, are quite different things. Quite as distinct as the idea of the goddess is from that of the priestess. All the ancient queens of Egypt were priestesses of Isis; but it is quite absurd to suppose that she should claim to be both goddess and priest.

And it should be further remarked, that the imperfect tense of this verb is here used, which denotes the continuance of an unfinished action. We can say she used to deliver oracles, *both then* and *formerly*; but we can hardly say that she was in the habit of taking the title of new Isis, *both then* and *formerly*! For while delivering pretended oracles may be indulged in occasionally, names and titles are something more permanent.

But Robinson refers also to Polybius 5.57.2., the text of which runs thus: *Egkaloön kai diamas turomenos prooton men epi too tetolmenai diadeema perithesthai kai Basilea chreematisein.* Which is thus literally rendered: Arraigning him, he solemnly testified that he had first dared to put a crown upon his head, and that *the king will take the name*, or in our idiom he will take the name of king. The word for king here is a subject accusative, and in that respect, and in that alone, it conforms to *matheetas* of Acts 11:26. But it differs widely from that construction in the following particulars. *Chreematisein* differs in mode and tense (one or both) from every other verb in the sentence; but chiefly because the subject accusative is put in apposition with no other by which the title to be taken is expressed, and for the best of all reasons, such title is already fully described in the subject itself; and any appositive

explanation would be a redundancy. To make the above example quadrate with Acts 11:26, it would have to read *teuton ton andra chreematisein Basilea*. But if such an example was ever dreamed of in classic literature, we have no evidence of it, for when such *savants* as Dr. Robinson and Liddell and Scott have sought in vain for such an example, we may safely conclude it has no existence.

The reader will please observe, if we apply this idiom to Acts 11:26. *matheetas* is made to take its name from, or by means of the appositive noun *christianous*; but such is not the form of this laconic idiom. Had Luke intended to use this construction of the active voice, he simply would have said *christian chreematasia*. *They were called Christians*. But as this construction differs so radically from that of the actual text, we may safely conclude that Luke could only have used *chreematasia* in its active biblical sense, and that these supposed subject accusatives, are not subjects at all, but object accusatives, and governed by the active verb *chreematasia*; which verb expresses the inspired action of Paul and Barnabas.

17. But if we put the claims of both these constructions upon an equality, so far as grammar is concerned, yet the analogy of the faith would forbid, that we should decide in favor of that rendition, which eliminates all divine agency from the impartation of the Christian name.

For such a version makes failures of two prophecies of Isaiah, 62:2. "And thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name."

And 65:15. "And ye shall leave your name, for a curse to my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." It also renders unmeaning Eph. 3:14.15. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." This is conclusive evidence that Jehovah gave the family name of

The best thinkers among Protestants, have adopted that system of interpretation called the "*Analogy of the Faith*," by which it is understood, that where, there is an ambiguous word, or phrase, that the sense most consentaneous with the general drift of the Scriptures, shall be preferred to that which introduces inconsistency, or confusion. But Catholics follow the interpretation of their Church Father's, at whatever sacrifice; and we have to confess that certain conservative Protestants sometimes prefer an *old* mistake to a *new* correction.

his people, as he had promised by Isaiah the prophet. But there is a distinction between naming, and calling. The followers of Jesus were called his disciples, but they were not named disciples. Learners of any teacher whatever, are disciples, not by virtue of having been so named, for such distinction is common to all learners. So also were they called *Brethren* and *Saints*, but neither of these were proper names, and were they susceptible of being converted into such, they would by no means meet the demands of Isaiah's prophecy, for neither of these words were "new" to the Israelites, in the Apostles' day, nor would they be "another" name than which God's ancient people had ever been called, for the Israelites were called Brethren, and their holy men were always called Saints, but none of them were ever called Christians, until the disciples were so named by inspiration at Antioch. So the name Christian was entirely "new," and altogether "another" differing from anything ancient Israel had ever known. Indeed it is a word from another language, the Greek; a language with which the Hebrews of Isaiah's time, were unacquainted. We are thus enabled by the light of history and prophecy, to identify the name, which the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has given the whole family in Heaven, and on earth.

18. THE SINAITIC READING dispenses entirely with the subject accusative, and gives us the possessive dative instead *Egenet de autois* not *autois*. Kuhner's grammar says "The dative is used to denote the possessor with the verbs *cinai*, *upar chein*, and *genesthai*, these verbs then being translated by the verb "to have," and the dative as the nominative; e.g. *Kuros een megaleen basileia*, Cyrus had a great kingdom.

Now if we translate Acts 11:26, according to this rule, we not only eliminate the subject accusative, but the "came to pass" of the common version as well; and the rendition will be literally thus: "And they had to assemble themselves with the Church for a whole year, and teach a great multitude, and declare, or pronounce the disciples Christians first at Antioch." If we take this reading as of unexceptional authority, we can have no difficulty whatever in determining how the disciples came by the name Christian; for if Paul and Barnabas had to meet with the Church, and teach the multitude, it is as plain as language can make it, that they had also to declare the disciples Christians first at Antioch.

Another advantage of the Sinaitic reading is, that it puts an estopple to that inconsistent criticism on the particle *τε*; for in this reading there is no "*came to pass that*," to which this miraculous little *τε* can reach back and fasten on to as its governing phrase. For reach which way it may, it can only find "have" as government to every one of these infinitives.

19. A friend of mine, of considerable pretensions, calls in question the notion, that the possessive dative can be made to express obligation to do anything. But whenever the object of possession is a verb in the infinitive mood, privilege, or obligation is always expressed. See Acts 20:16. In the common version, the sense, not the grammar, is given. But in the Revision, the grammar of the original is shown in bold relief. "That he might not have to spend time in Asia." Here the idea of obligation is expressed without a peradventure. But the dative of possession is not always governed by an expressed neuter verb, but even in such cases where the governing word is omitted, it as frequently implies obligation to do, as its object of relation terminates on an active infinitive. In I. Cor. 5:12, *εστι* is understood: *τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν*; literally "They have I to judge them that are without?" The common version, "What have I to do, to judge them that are without?" is a feeble redundancy. The meaning plainly is, "Why must I judge them who are without?" Under the head of eliptical possessive dative, may be ranged the phrase *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; "*What is to me and thee* in common? What have I with thee;" implying disapprobation, or also displeasure. Robin. Lex. N. T., ego. 3. In Mark 5:7. the demoniac cries out to Jesus *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί* what have I (or must I) do with thee? Luke 8:28., the same identical expression occurs again under similar, if not the identical circumstances. Also, in Matt. 8:29., the same idiom is again used, with first personal pronoun put in the plural. Here two demoniacs make the same inquiry, with the same implication of immense displeasure.

In John 2:4, Jesus answers his mother in this same idiom, when she told him they were out of wine. In this case we hardly conceive of either displeasure or disapprobation. Yet the notion that obligation to do something was implied in the information then given, is plain enough if we render the passage thus: "What have I and you to do [with the wine.] But though we may thus

eliminate all displeasure from this single example, yet the obligation to act, remains in all its force, and it is this characteristic of the possessive dative which is called in question. II Samuel 16:10, "And the king said, What have I to do with you, sons of Zeruiah?" Or more properly, "What *must* I do with you," etc., expressive of disappointment and disapprobation. Also, in II Samuel 19:22 the same expression again recurs to the same persons, expressive of the same sentiment.

From all these examples, it is plain that the Greek dative governed by *εἶναι*, *ὑπαρξείν* and *γενεσθαι*, expresses obligation just as intensely as the Latin genitive governed by *suum*, e. g. *Militum est suo duci parere*. "It is the duty of soldiers to obey their leader." Or, "Soldiers have to, *must* obey," etc., so unless the analogy of language, upon which all grammar is built, be deceptive and vain, as Saul and Barnabas had to meet with and teach the Church, so they had to pronounce the disciples "Christians."

20. For wise reasons, the Church of Christ went without a distinctive name for the first ten years of its existence. It is true in these latter ages it is customary to have our sons and daughters named in their cradle, but other customs prevailed anciently. Names were then frequently given to persons of riper years, in compliment, or otherwise, to some of their characteristic peculiarities. Indeed, a child, so long as he is in his mother's nursery, needs no name but some common appellative, such as babe, child, or little boy; but as soon as he needs to be recognized by the outside world he must have a proper name. So at the day of Pentecost, and for some years after, while the Gospel was preached to Jews only, they needed nothing to distinguish them from other Jews more than such pseudonyms as Galileans, Nazarenes, or the more respectable appellative, Disciples of Christ; but even this last is nothing more than an appellative, and by no means a proper name; and to one outside of the Jewish nation, it had no distinctive significance. By the most liberal and intelligent of the Gentile world it could only be understood as a sect of the Jewish religion, and everything Jewish was looked upon with unremitting disfavor.

21. But that there was an advantage in this nameless condition of the Church at Jerusalem, is too plain to admit of question; and that this advantage was fair and legitimate is also equally evident. For all the preeminence God had accorded the Jewish na-

tion was in order to bring out of it the Church, with Christ at its head, to enlighten the world; and strange indeed would it have been had not the Father of Lights required his consecrated people to foster his rising Church, seeing it was both the end of their nationality and the climax of their glory to thus enlighten the Gentiles. God overruled the selfishness of that nation to effect this end, though the Jews were unwilling to show the new economy the slightest favor.

The Church instituted on the day of Pentecost was misunderstood at home, and so far abroad as known, to be a sect of the Judaic religion. Hence, when "the sound of a rushing mighty wind" came from heaven, and Peter's inspired sermon touched the hearts of the assembled nations, both the brazen sea and every bath of the Temple would be at the service of the Apostles should they require such accommodations. That the Apostles and early converts were not excluded from the Temple, we learn from the 46th verse of this same chapter of Acts. It is quite evident that many temporary advantages accrued to the infant Church from this mistake of the unbelievers; but so soon as this misunderstanding was turned against the Church, a new requirement arose.

22. The Jews, in their subjugation to the Romans, were allowed certain privileges. They were permitted to practice their own religion and punish violations of its worship among their own people. In the case of Stephen, they carried this privilege a little too far, for Roman law allowed them to put no man to death; however, they began from this to claim the right of punishing ecclesiastical offenders. So the young Saul of Tarsus, taking advantage of this Roman license by virtue of a warrant from the High Priest, went about arresting men and women and committing them to prison. While this persecution was raging, the Brethren went "as far as Phenice and Cyprus, preaching the word to Jews only." Not far from this time Samaria received the word; and as proselyting ran low at Jerusalem, Peter goes as far as Lydda, preaching the Gospel to Jews and comforting believers. From Lydda, he goes to Joppa, and thence to Caesarea, to open the door of faith to the Gentiles. The history of this interesting event occupied the whole of the tenth chapter of Acts and part of the eleventh. Now so soon as the right of the Gentiles to enter the New Kingdom is established, its citizens are no longer Jews mere-

ly: hence they need a new name, not only to disenthral the Church from Jewish persecution and to avert the prejudice the Gentiles cherished against the Jews as a hated nation, but also to have a name comprehensive enough to unite all nations under the headship of one common Lord and Christ; for, let it be distinctly noted, that the persecutions of the Jews against the disciples, were tolerated by the Romans on the supposition that they were Jews, and so under the jurisdiction of the High Priest. Hence, their being confounded with the Jews, which at first was an advantage to the infant Church, became in process of time a great calamity. For this misunderstanding not only gave the High Priest pretext for vexing the Church, but the same blunder closed the ears of Gentiles also. "Disciples of Jesus!" they would say "Jesus was a Jew!" And this allegation was sufficient to raise a mob, both at Ephesus and Philippi. "These men being Jews do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans."

In such an extremity, a new name for the Church became an imperative necessity, as it would at once strip the High Priest of his pretext for persecuting the saints, and disarm the Gentiles of their anti-Judaic prejudice. And a name bringing such relief to the saints, and opening such an effectual door for the conversion of the Gentiles, deserves to have a divine origin. The time when, and the place where this name was given, as well as its significance, all conspire to point us to the wisdom of God rather than to the folly of a nicknaming rabble. Hence, there can be no reasonable doubt but the name Christian is the one referred to in Isaiah 62:2 and 65:15. In the last reference, the rejection of the Jews is so plainly connected with the impartation of that "other name," by which the servants of the Lord were to be called when Judaism was to be slain—that it seems impossible to apply this prophecy to "the casting off of the Jews" without implying that the Lord's people were to be invested with "another name," differing from all the appellatives by which they had ever been known; but this, of all scripture names, can only apply to that "which first at Antioch was given."

Then again, the place where this name was given, is an important factor in the evidence of its divinity. Had it been given at the great Jewish capital, it would have militated against its success in the Gentile world, but coming from Antioch, a Gentile city,

celebrated both for its wealth, and privileges, having been made a free city by Pompey—originating from such a metropolis, it could but start with a prestige very respectable in the eyes of the Roman world. The time also of this transaction at Antioch, synchronizes with the period which followed the conversion of Saul, a season of great prosperity as described in Acts 9:31. "Then had the churches rest," etc. On such signal occasions, nicknames are not usually given, and we know, from the multitudes which attended their ministrations, that the cause at Antioch was not in low repute.

It had been objected that the word *Christian* is an adjective. Such at first, perhaps it was, but adjectives derived from proper names always have a possessive signification. Thus, the Fabian highway, meant the highway of Fabius. So when a man is a Christian we know that he belongs to Christ.

But it is again objected that Christ is an official name, and not a proper one. This is simply a mistake, for proper names are the names of individuals. And "The Christ" individualizes the Savior as no other name under heaven can. Other men have been called Jesus. Other benefactors of men, have been called Saviors. But he of Nazareth, is *the only Christ* in the universe! And the official bearing of this name, points us to kingdom, and priesthood, offices when worthily worn, the highest known to man.

But it is a very pretentious name. This is sometimes urged as an objection. But really to every reflecting mind, it must appear as an evidence of its divinity. For Christ, who was meeker than Moses, wore a name "higher than the kings of the earth!" So the humble followers of Jesus, with all their humility, are called upon to bear a name, which is the epitome and paragon of all earthly perfection.

The fact that the necessity of the case demanded a new name, does not derogate from its being given by divine authority. For such cases under Moses met with divine legislation. Witness the division of judicial labor suggested by Jethro, and the case of Zelophehad's daughters. Exo. 18:17--24, and Josh. 17:3.

But had there been no prophecy as to the origin of the name, propriety alone would suggest that the family should be named from him, who is called the Father of the everlasting age. Especially since Paul applies such scriptures as this to Christ and his family. "Behold I, and the children which God hath given me."

If God gave the Church to Christ, as children are given to a father, then has he a divine right to invest it, with his own name; and the Church would be rebellious, and lose her hold on The Head, did she prefer any other name.

RESUME.

That the name Christian was given by an act of God, is proved. 1st, by the prophecy, that God would slay, or cast off Israel, and call her people by "another name." Isa. 65:15. And "by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord should name." Ib. 62:2. And 2nd, because the verb *Chreematizo*, as used in the scriptures, both in the Old Testament and the New, with but one exception, uniformly expresses a divine oracle, or a declaration of God, and this is the word used in Acts 11:26, for conferring the name; hence as the scriptural meaning of this word harmonizes with the scriptures of the prophets, and as there is no other place in the living oracles where that God-given name was conferred, the evidence is conclusive, that it was done at Antioch. 3rd. The adverse argument is built upon the one exception of Rom. 7:3. But this is shown to be palpably against fourteen examples of its use in the scriptures, *with none in its favor*, when rightly understood. And next it does violence to the structure of the sentence. But this again, is attempted to be mended by an unauthorised criticism on the enclitic *τε*, assuming that this particle following the conjunction *και*, indicates a change of construction. In answer to this, we have exhibited twelve examples of *τε* following *και*, in which such assumption is clearly confuted.

4. It has also been shown, that the text in question, is incapable of solution by the idiom of Rom. 7:3. This was done, by elaborate quotations from the Classics, where this idiom of the active voice, is used, and all these quotations were taken from the references of our most learned opponents.

5. The Sinaitic reading of Acts 11:26, was also referred to, where we have the possessive dative instead of the accusative. This reading makes it certain, that Paul and Barnabas gave the name. For if grammatically rendered, it will be, "they had to assemble * * and teach * * * and declare the disciples Christians first at Antioch."

But since the writing of the foregoing essay, the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort, has been received, and the Sinaitic reading

of this possessive dative, is therein exhibited as of paramount authority. So this being the authorized reading, it only requires such knowledge of Greek grammar, as to enable the translator to know the possessive dative, when he sees it, to put this question forever to rest.

The question will no doubt be honestly asked, how it was possible, that so many able men could be mistaken in translating this single passage?

Possibly it was caused by translators following their predecessors' renderings, without making independent investigation. Or the initiatory blunder may be referred to the misinformation of such translators, as Arias Montanus, Theodore Beza, and others of that period; for the Greek language is better understood to-day, than in the twilight of the dawning reformation, or in the dull gloaming of the receding Dark Ages.

To urge against these philological demonstrations, based as they are on the bedrock of verbal criticism, the authority of great names, can but be looked upon as that species of sophism called *Argumentum ad hominem*.

B. U. WATKINS.

THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL.

PART III.

RESTORATION OF THE SIMPLICITY—DANGER OF RELAPSE—DUTY OF PLEADING FOR A PURE GOSPEL.

It is refreshing to observe that there have been a number of noble souls who, for more than two centuries past, have stood up grandly for the *Word of God*; and, in spite of their systems, *protested* by their labors, not only against the super-added sacraments of Papacy, image-worship, and ritualism in general; but against that speculative philosophy which teaches that man is the passive recipient of an influencing grace, proceeding directly from God and impelling the soul "made willing," to the exercise of faith. Shall we hear the testimony of a few of the witnesses?

ROBERT SOUTH, one of the ornaments of the Church of England, in a discourse on "The Image of God in Man," delivered at the Cathedral of St. Paul in 1662, says, in conclusion: "The Christian religion is the great and *only means* that God has sanctified and designed to repair the breaches of humanity; to set fallen man on his legs again; *to clarify his reason, rectify his will, and compose and regulate his affections.*"

BENJAMIN KEACH, the great Baptist preacher in London for thirty-six years in the reign of Charles the Second, had a most exalted conception of the power of the Gospel upon the heart of man. In his sermon on "The Scriptures Superior to all Spiritual Manifestations," we find the following passages: "That word that is more sure than the voice which came from the excellent glory in the Holy Mount, must be of the purest emanation that can proceed from God. It must enlighten the mind and purify the heart. It must be a light shining in a dark place, and one that will guide man from earth to heaven. Now the Apostle Peter emphatically declares that the Gospel of the Son of God is the word more sure than the voice from heaven on the Mount. (11 Pet. 1-19) Therefore the Gospel is God's power for the salvation of the human soul,

It is the great discerner of the thoughts and feelings of the mind. It is the director which the Spirit of God has given. It is the word that endures forever—profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness.”

South and Keach were both two hundred years ahead of the age in which they lived, and we would kindly suggest that many of their brethren of the pulpit in the present year of grace are two hundred years behind the times. We mean by this that the investigations of earnest, intelligent, honest Bible students, all over the civilized world during the present century, have resulted in the deep conviction that such a moral phenomenon as miraculous conversion never was, never will be, and never can be so long as God is God and Jesus Christ in his Prophet.

I make one more extract from a preacher of more than a hundred years ago—the noble VON HERDER—a man as bold as Luther himself: “God has seen fit to let us have a clear and definite *voice*, which shall teach us what He is and what we are; indicate our relations to Him, exhort us to all good and teach us our immortality. He has instituted for us the rule of faith and practice, and lo! this is our Bible. It is yet more than this. I am a fallen creature in the sight of God. I am a sinner. How shall I comfort myself? Upon what conditions will God pardon, and how may I be reconciled to him? Ah! here all is silent—reason, creation, conscience, conjecture, world-wisdom! Compassionate being! Shouldst thou not have had pity on thy creation, and through a *positive revelation*, declared to him thy will and given him consolation! Lo! this is our Bible. It is yet more. I have not strength sufficient to transform my whole nature. How then, O, Gracious God? shall I not hope from thee and expect that thou, *through a definite revelation*, shouldst animate my heart, unlock the riddle of my destiny, establish my immortality, and make me firm and faithful in virtue and tranquility of mind. *And lo! this does the Bible.*” Brethren, let us all say Amen.

If Von Herder were living in this country now, and he should preach such sermons as the one from which this eloquent extract is taken, he would be denounced as a heretic, at all events as not orthodox.

All these grand men were lights shining in darkness, but the darkness comprehended them not.

Early in the present century the noble-hearted CHALMERS, rising above his creed, uttered sentiments worthy the character of a true defender of the faith. In a discourse on "*The Expulsive power of a New Affection*," he says: "The Gospel brings for admittance to the very door of our heart, an affection which, once seated upon its throne, will either subordinate every previous inmate, or bid it away; so that in the Gospel we do so behold God that we may love God. It there and there only, where God stands revealed as an object of confidence to sinners. If the heart be without God, the world will have the ascendancy. It is God apprehended by the believer as God in Christ, who alone can displace it from this ascendancy. The preacher, then, has a truth in his possession, which, into whatever heart it enters, will, like the rod of Aaron, swallow up them all; and with him is deposited that ascendant influence under which the leading tastes and tendencies of the old man are destroyed, and he becomes a new creature in Jesus Christ our Lord."

We have no room for further extracts from the sermons of distinguished men. The few we have given show that there have been men "all along the line" who, despite of human systems of theology, have had high and noble conceptions of the love of God and the grace of Christ.

But we know of no organized effort to restore the gospel to its true dignity and simplicity until about the close of the second decade of the present century. More than a half century has passed away, and more than a half million of people in America and Europe have become persuaded that theological systems, as expressed in Calvinism, Arminianism, Universalism or Swedenborgianism can never save a soul from perdition. Still further, it is evident that the adoption of a creed by the intellect cannot work a change in the moral character of man. A severe critic may take the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, and the one grand article of the Church of Christ, compare these creeds with one another, and both with the New Testament, and, after cool deliberation, pronounce in favor of the Christian Creed, and yet Christ be far away from him—his heart may be full of Satan.

It has, therefore, been the aim of the colaborers in the Restoration to set forth the true *Psychology* of the Christian system—teaching the uselessness of Dogmatic Theology and urging the importance of consecrating the whole mind to the proper service of

the Redeemer of man—to believe in God and believe in Christ—to love God and love Christ—to obey God and obey Christ. They have earnestly contended that faith which works by love, and not a philosophy of faith, saves man by leading him to obedience. They have contended that Christianity is humanity added to Divinity—the human mind submitting to the divine—man worshipping God by God's direction. They have contended that the Bible is a complete revelation, and that God does not convert the sinner miraculously, nor guide the saint by new inspirations. They have contended that the ordinances—Baptism, the Lord's Supper and Ordination—must be observed in accordance with apostolic precept and practice, divesting all of them of the mystical sacramental grace with which they have been invested by Antichrist, and showing that they are methods of drawing near unto God in full assurance of faith, to receive a divine blessing.

They have contended that Congregational worship consists in

1. The supplications, hymn-singing, Scripture-reading and exhortations of an assembly of saints on the first day of the week.
2. The partaking of the Supper in commemoration of the death and sufferings of Christ.
3. The monied contributions, or financial fellowship.

For the greater part of this century thousands of congregations on both sides of the Atlantic have been worshipping after this simple manner, and the more they search the Scriptures the more thoroughly are they convinced that this is a part of the simplicity which is in Christ. They, therefore, earnestly commend it to all who desire to be delivered from the thralldom of Sacerdotalism and transferred into the liberty of the children of God.

Still further, these people, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, and viewing with regret the tyranny of Ecclesiasticism which has reigned for more than fifteen centuries, have contended most earnestly that every thing in the form of diocesan Episcopacy—county, state, national or imperial—is contrary to the word of God, and that God will not approve of any such development or evolution.

Happily there has been, for years past, growth in the right direction—growth in knowledge, and growth in the adoption of measures compatible with divine methods.

Many a pious soul, twenty years ago, trembled for "Our Zion,"

declaring that our conventions were ecclesiastic legislatures. What are the facts? In the period designated we have had several thousand county conventions, five or six hundred state conventions, and twenty national conventions, *but not one single edict!* "Prove all things, hold fast to the good." While then they contend for congregational government, through the instrumentality of Bishops or Overseers, they are ready for counsel and co-operation by means of association. And thus have they attempted to *restore* the true government of the Church. We think the influence of the effort has been felt. "Preachers in charge" are not quite so dictatorial as they were fifty years ago. God speed the good work!

In conclusion, I desire to suggest that there may be danger of falling back into the corruption of the past ages. We may speculate on the Incarnation until we lose sight of the manifested God. We may admire the Hero on the cross until we lose sight of the suffering Savior. We may study the Trinity of theologians until we fail to remember that Jesus is the Christ. We may listen to the specious reasoning of an eloquent man until he will almost persuade us that Faith does not come by hearing the word of God, but by divine force. We may attend the ministrations of some demented evangelist until we feel doubtful whether Baptism to a penitent believer is for the remission of sins or not. We may lend a listening ear to the cogent reasoning of a talented author until we think it is not at all important to attend the weekly assembly of the saints. We may fall in love with *Mammon*, forget God, and refuse to contribute to the support of the Church. We may become captivated with pipe, organs, and German performers, fancy singers and heartless singing, short lectures and stolen sermons, esthetic pulpits and sunflower preachers, until we "forget the Lord our God" and "go after other Gods to worship them."

Let us contend, then, for the simplicity which is in Christ—simplicity in faith, morals, manners, worship, government, duty and doctrine; pointing the sinner to the meek and lowly Savior—building up one another in our most holy faith, and seeking for glory, honor and immortality.

W. J. BARBEE.

THE QUESTION SETTLED.

If we are to believe some men, questions concerning our faith are never to be settled. As each generation comes, the same things are to be discussed as though they were new matters, and never before considered. Such a thing as is contemplated by the gospel of Christ, that men should have their faith established, no more to be questioned, because settled and determined, with such men this is an evidence of bigotry, ignorance, and indolent and culpable contentment with what one knows. With these doubters and wise men, wise because they are doubters, the faith of no age can be so settled as not to be subject to the criticism of the next. Each generation is to begin the discussion afresh, and go over the same ground as that gone over by the preceding, that it may have its faith formed anew by its own efforts. Yet these men talk loudly and continually of progression; of the infancy, childhood, youthhood and manhood states of the race; whereas with them, each generation begins as an infant. If matters of our faith are never to be considered as settled, if one generation is not to stand on the shoulders of its predecessor, then all this talk about the progress of the race from generation to generation is the merest twaddle.

Some things *are* settled, things that belong to every department of knowledge. It is only on this ground that there can be any progress in knowledge. If the principles established by the theories and problems of geometry are not to be regarded as conclusive, then there can be no progress in that science. The primary truths and principles established by each problem as the geometer proceeds, lays the foundation on which he builds in subsequent problems and theories. The same is true in all departments of human knowledge, or science, and it is no less true in regard to matters of faith. So the apostle teaches in the 6th chapter of Hebrews. There was no doubt in his mind about the Messiahship of Jesus, nor of the divinity of his nature. These were no open questions of faith with him, and can not be with any one who credits his testimony and believes in his inspiration; hence we

have data on which to proceed further. These are not debatable.

It is not men of conviction who are continually raising questions of doubt in regard to matters of our faith; but men without conviction, philosophic doubters, as they are pleased to call themselves, who think it an evidence of genius or talent to doubt what apostles and prophets believed, what the best men of our race have believed profoundly and sincerely, compared with whom these skeptics are as the light of the glow worm in comparison with the light of the sun.

The rationalistic principle that will believe nothing that is opposed to reason, as men may call reason, though in the Bible and uttered by God through prophet or apostle, sweeps away at one brush the revelation of God. It puts poor, erring, feeble human reason above God, and asks reasonable men to worship that god instead. If we ask these wise men for a fish, they give us a serpent; if for bread, they give us a stone. If we ask them for a faith, they give us doubt as the true road to faith and knowledge; and yet with them there is and can be no faith or knowledge. There can be nothing but doubt, for this is man's highest reason and attainment.

I am speaking of faith, not of opinions; of convictions, and not of matters of which we can have no convictions. The former we have on testimony, not on inferences; on facts, and not on suppositions. The testimony complete and facts established as facts, our faith and convictions rest on a solid and immovable foundation, and are not to be disturbed until the testimony is successfully impeached, and the facts shown to be fictitious. Until then our convictions and faith are not to be questioned.

But skeptics would have us believe that there can never come a time when Doubt, the magic wand of modern criticism, will not raise questions regarding the testimony and facts on which Christianity is presumed to rest, and test these by modern methods of criticism, and hence such men delight more in reading Modern Critics who question the grounds of our faith, than they do "the testimony of Jesus." In reply to this it may be said, there will never come a time until the Millennium is in its zenith in the world, that the Devil will cease to stir up his friends to aid him in his work of destruction. But a time does come when the enlightened mind and conscience do regard some things as settled, and some questions as closed. Law has its presumptions, and reason has its,

and these presumptions are so fixed and settled and determined, that any question of doubt regarding them is no longer entertainable. Law and reason are entitled to proceed on their presumptions until some one clearly shows that these presumptions are unlawful and unreasonable—contrary to correct principles of law and reason. The burden of proof lies on him who denies the presumption or calls it in question.

Christianity has been so long in the world, has occupied intelligent ground so long, and has so well entrenched itself in the minds and hearts of men, that it is not to be dispossessed by the wave of the hand, or the doubt of some skeptic. It has been too long and too firmly established in the world to be overturned even by cyclones of doubt and infidelity, as was tried by the French Revolution. There was a time when the burden of proof lay on it. It then made full proof of its claims, established itself firmly by proper, competent and ample testimony, overran the then civilized world; conquered the philosophies of the world, and made itself supreme over the minds of men, and now for 1800 years has continued to hold possession. The best and greatest minds of the race have given it their submission; its proofs and testimonials have stood the scrutiny of all opposers, and it now has possession. Who can dispossess it? or what can disturb its claims? It has well established its claims, conquered its possession of the field. It is no longer on the defensive. It speaks with authority and commands and demands submission. It pleads with the world, not for its own sake, but for that of men. Jesus Christ is no longer in the hands of his enemies, nor his people pleading for protection from their enemies. He is on the throne and his people in power. The Church is no longer a suppliant, but powerful in her possessions; and were her people as faithful as the Master expects, she would be invincible. She may now well rest on her conquests. She has conquered a peace, and henceforth wages an aggressive war. Like a mighty cyclone, she will yet sweep the earth. No puny obstacle can stand in her way and impede her progress. "Christianity now exists, and those who deny the divine origin attributed to it, are bound to show some reasons for assigning to it a human origin; not indeed to prove that it *did* originate in this or that way, without supernatural aid; but to point out some conceivable way in which it *might* have arisen."—*Whately*.

Christianity is a fact in its origin and existence. The religion of Christ, unlike all other religions, is founded on facts. It is pre-eminently a personal religion, for it is founded on the person of the incarnate Logos. Other religions are more or less systems of morals or philosophy. Christianity necessarily embraces morals, because it aims at a holy life. It is philosophical, though not a philosophy. Its chief aim is eminently practical—the salvation of men from sin and all its consequences, and this salvation is through a person, the incarnate Logos, and by his atonement. Christ comes before the world as the God-man, the divine son of Mary, and claims the obedience of every human soul.

His claims must be granted, and submission given of the entire person of the sinner, or he is left in his sins and to their terrible consequences. One that makes this claim must be of infinite importance to mankind. He comes as the incarnate Logos. On this are based all his claims. If he be not this, all that is claimed for him, as teacher or atonement, falls to the ground. As teacher and atonement he stands or falls. They are inseparable. The teacher is nothing to the world, if he be not also the atonement.

This claim on the part of Christ being false, nothing in the Bible is true; for many facts of the Bible are either directly or indirectly connected with him; so that if he is not what he claimed to be, we have no assurance of the truth of any fact recorded in the entire book. He is the central thought of the whole book toward which all facts and truths point directly or indirectly. The history of the race, as given in the Old Testament, is inseparably connected with him. Some of the facts of this history are events; some institutions whose conception and inception lie beyond and above the powers of the human mind; and some are so unnatural and improbable, that they could not have been conceived or anticipated. Others, again, are so apparently isolated and disconnected that their relation to other facts remote in time from them, would never have been known, had not that relation been pointed out by unquestionable authority. To give an imperfect idea of how firmly Christianity is intrenched within facts, and how the truth of these facts is established in turn by the truth of Christianity, some of these facts may be mentioned and their mention not considered out of place here.

No human foresight could have anticipated or philosophy con-

ceived the nature and extent of the results and consequences which followed the transgression in Eden. It is quite probable that even angels could not. This much is intimated by the Apostle Peter. Much less could man have done so. Yet we now know that these results and consequences necessitated the incarnation of the divine Logos and the atonement of Christ, if man was to be saved from sin and its consequences.

An atonement lies at the foundation of all forgiveness, and is natural to the mind and heart of man when an offense has been given and received. But who could have conceived what kind of an atonement was demanded by the sin in Eden? Animal sacrifice was ordained, but it was ordained by God, and looked forward to the atonement of Christ. When Adam sinned, the atonement of Christ by the incarnation at once arose in prospect, and Eden and the cross became at once connected, and from that time forth every animal sacrifice pointed to the incarnation of the divine Logos and was its prediction and pledge; so that sacrifice existing, the crucifixion of Christ became a necessity, a fixed and settled purpose of the administration of God.

The institution of animal sacrifice, imperfect and inadequate as it was, was instituted, there can be no doubt, for several purposes, one of which was the fulfillment of the promise made the sinning pair on the day of their transgression. In that promise lay the hopes of the world; but just how it was to be fulfilled, none could have conjectured. The promise was certainly not clearly understood before its fulfillment, and possibly could not have been, so obscure was its language. It was not difficult, however, to understand from it, that some one of woman born would overcome the power of the serpent; but if we mark the significance of the language—that the offspring of the *woman* should accomplish this—the subject is certainly involved in difficulty. But now, since the fulfillment, its meaning is clear. We now know that it had reference to the incarnation of the Logos, a thing that none could have imagined. Jesus, we know, was the son of *Mary*, of *God*, but not of *Joseph*. He was the only one of the race having such a genesis. The language of the promise corresponds exactly with the genesis of Jesus as given by Matthew and Luke. Is this coincidence accidental? The promise was prophetic of the son of God; not simply of his person, but also of his nature. Here we have things 4,000

years apart, very intimately—indeed, inseparably—connected; and this connection makes the genesis of Jesus an irrefutable proof of the truth or fact of the promise and the promise of the genesis of Jesus. This proof is singularly striking and extremely forcible when we consider the natural impossibility of such a genesis viewed from a human standpoint. It is certainly contrary to all that we know of the law of reproduction. Parthenogenesis is not a law of the organic world even in the lowest forms of life. It is certainly not in the higher forms. Jesus is the only instance known. He is the only man of the race that had a human mother, and not a human father. This was in exact accordance with the promise: "The offspring of the *woman* shall bruise the serpent's head."

There is another fact inseparably connected with animal sacrifice, which was both prophetic and significant, and when we understand this fact, it can not be otherwise interpreted than referring to the incarnation of the Logos, or the divine genesis of Jesus. This fact was the consecrated altar under Judaism. We do not read of any consecration of the altar of animal sacrifice under the Patriarchal Age. Under Judaism the purpose of the altar is explained. It was designed to consecrate the sacrifice when offered on it; to give it a quality it did not before possess, though in its person it was all that the law required. It is thus seen that two things were essentially necessary to an atonement for sin—the sacrifice and the altar. What, then, was the significance of the altar? The animal pointed to Christ; and as the animal and altar were inseparably connected, we must find something in the person of Jesus that meets the consecration; that must have the power and effect of rendering his human life an effective atonement. It was Christ's human life that was sacrificed; and though there is more in the death of a man than in the death of an animal, yet in both cases it is the animal life that is extinguished by death. There is nothing, therefore, in the person of Christ that can represent the consecrated altar but his divine nature. This being so, the consecrated altar and the divinity of the Lord Jesus are seen to be connected, so that the former was a proof of the latter as well as a pledge of its connection with the atonement. Now, it is impossible to believe that this connection was accidental. Here, again, we have things very remote from each other, closely and inseparably connected in the scheme of redemption.

The chief purpose in view in the incarnation was the atonement, and the chief purpose of the atonement is the remission of sins. In remission there is a two-fold separation—the soul from its sins, and the saved sinner from the world. This isolation seemed to God essentially necessary, otherwise he would not have ordained it. The separation that takes place in remission is called a new birth and a new creation, indicating the radical character of the physical change which the spirit of man undergoes in this process. This change as respects the spirit, is followed by a like radical change in the *state* of the man. He is removed from the world and placed in the Church where only the newly created are. Here they are prepared for heaven by a life-training. Though yet in the world as respects their body, they are not of the world in spirit. All this is plain to every reader of the New Testament. But could or did any Jew see that these facts were foreshadowed by the initial events of his race? Did he see that his own isolation, by the two-fold means of birth and circumcision from what he called the gentile world, foreshadowed the Church of God? Or did he see any relation or connection between the birth of his progenitor, Isaac, and the separation connected with the remission of sins? It is certain that no Jew did. Yet here we have two events very closely connected, though separated in time by 2,000 years. So intimate and close is the connection between Isaac and Christ, that the former would never have been born as he was, had not a "seed" been first promised, through whom Abraham was to become the father of many nations. Moreover, the genesis of Isaac was in a sense supernatural, which fact makes him still more emphatically a true and proper type of the promised seed; the one a son of faith, and the other the son of God.

Many other facts in the Old Testament might be noted which would further show how closely and intimately connected are the fundamental facts of Christianity with certain facts in the history of the Jews, and how well it is entrenched by such facts, because of such connection, the facts of each corroborate the other, and make the position of Christianity not successfully assailable.

As Christianity rests on facts, and not on theories and inferences; as it is a fact as well as a religion; and as it is entrenched by facts which are unassailable; as the question as to its claims was settled when the testimony was all in, and ample and sufficient,

we have the right to demand that the question as to its authenticity, and everything vitally connected with it, shall be regarded as settled, and the discussion in this respect closed. This testimony is stereotyped, and thus fixed and unalterable forever. It has been so often unsuccessfully assailed that it may be justly regarded as impregnable: and were the matter simply a question about an historical fact, "the testimony of Jesus" would not now be questioned by any one. But since Christianity is also a religion and makes demands of men that are not relished by the carnal heart, its opponents continue to repeat the folly of unbelief, and declare that it must ever remain an open question.

If Jesus be the son of God, his word in no single instance can be disputed. If in any particular he is found an untrue witness, stating as a fact what is not a fact, then he can not be the son of God. Nothing is plainer or more evident than this. A divine being, or one inspired by God, cannot be mistaken as to a fact or a truth. Therefore, the men inspired by the Holy Spirit must be believed when they assert a fact or utter a truth. We can not now raise questions of doubt as to any thing all these have said. All this was settled in the beginning by the proper testimony. Though what they say contradicts our reason—what we think ought or ought not to be—if they have *said* it, the controversy is ended. What we call contradiction will be found on thorough investigation only *above* our reason. God's thoughts or thinking cannot be measured by man's thoughts or thinking. If the matter under discussion be in the Bible—a part of God's revelation; if he or any one inspired by him said it, that ends all doubt and questioning. Everything the opposite of this is infidel in a greater or less degree. The essence of infidelity is, the measuring of God's revelation by the standard of our poor, feeble, erring reason. If God said it, either in person or by inspired man, we dare not presume to question it. No principle of action can be plainer or truer than this.

To escape the odium of disputing what God has said, and at the same time attain the same purpose, it is held that the matters objected to are interpretations—that the text is spurious or has been corrupted. Here is where the infidelity of professing Christians comes in—not that all who thus think are to be classed as infidels; but this is the resort of unbelievers. Now, that interpolations of an erroneous character, spurious readings and corruptions

have crept into the original text of the inspired writings, none will question who have the slightest knowledge of the history of these writings. But it must not be forgotten or overlooked that Christians have been just as jealous of the text in these particulars, and have done more labor to free the text from them, than have all the infidels that ever lived or do yet live. Firm and earnest believers in God's word have worked laboriously in this direction, and we may now regard the text as virtually settled and established. The few possible errors now remaining, which cannot be pronounced false or true beyond all doubt, affect no fact, nor principle, nor doctrine which the Bible now contains. This being indisputably true, these pleas of interpolations, etc., can be no longer allowed in defense of error. To say that we will brush aside everything or anything found in the Scriptures that does not meet the approval of our reason, and offer the plea of a corrupted text in defence, can not deceive any one as to the true nature of such unbelief. The true nature of such unbelief will be seen to crop out in other matters, when, possibly, some fact or doctrine is the thing in issue. When men have so far made ship-wreck of their faith as to reject everything in the Scriptures not in accord with weak reason, their refuge for a time is a corrupted text. It is the history of all such men that the extent of a corrupted text constantly enlarges. They are but few at first, but in the end they cover almost the entire book. As regards all these matters, the discussion is closed. All that is known has been said and resaid to satisfy, and the world, learned and unlearned, still believes in the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, just as we now have them, and no man who believes in the Master can say that anyone is injured by anything therein found.

It would be no difficult matter to show that all the inspired writers agree with each other in regard to certain facts which are of fundamental importance; and when we remember that these writers lived in widely different ages of the world, their wonderful argument can be explained only on one hypothesis—the inspiration of the writers; an inspiration of which God was the immediate author, and not some supposed diluted form, partaking as much of the human as the divine element—"part iron, and part clay;" not that timid, sickly thing we sometimes hear advocated, that comes as the result of the writer's elevation of soul or enlargement

of horizon; but that robust kind, known and recognized by Christ and his apostles, that calls the scriptures *God's word*. This is what the Apostle Peter calls them; for, according to him, "Holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."

The times need a robust faith, not timid sentiment; a faith in God, in Christ, and in his apostles as the inspired vicegerents of Christ on earth, who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. We want a faith that does not care, or stop to inquire, *how* men are inspired by the Holy Spirit; *how* they are "moved" by him when writing under his direction. The *modus operandi* is no concern of ours. We have no need to invent theories of his action to get rid of difficulties. The difficulties had better remain insuperable than attempt to explain how God acts on the minds of men; for this we can never know, and need not know. The fact is sufficient for us; and he who pries into such things, and forms his faith according to his prying, is on the road that leads away from divine inspiration. When faith finds difficulties in its way, it is modest enough to believe that the difficulty lies with man and not in God or in inspiration. It may stand in wonder and amazement at such a fact as the incarnation; but it does not reject it because it can not understand or explain it; and yet it is contrary to all that man knows of the laws of reproduction. It does not fall into doubt and deny the fact, because man's mind can not understand how a divine being can be united to a human, and the union appear only as a man, who thinks and feels, who suffers hunger and thirst, wearies and requires rest as all men do. When faith takes hold on so stupendous and marvelous a fact as the incarnation, and receives it as cordially and undoubtingly as it does the humanity of Christ, it need not hesitate at anything else. By accepting the greatest difficulty in the scriptures, it is imbecile to hesitate at the smallest. The faith that is disturbed or shaken by apparent contradictions or discrepancies in statements of different writers of the scriptures, has certainly not mastered the incarnation nor the fact of inspiration. But if it accept these as veritable facts, why should it stagger at verbal discrepancies? Why or how be strong on the greatest and weak on the least?

There are some things in the word of God and perhaps many, which we can not now understand or explain, and very probably never will. They may lie above human reason. They are now

called unthinkable. It would be strange if such were not the case. But such things are not *above* our faith. We can believe anything that God says is true when he says it is true, whether we understand it or not. The prime question about the scriptures is, Are they the word of God? This settled by competent and proper testimony, all matters of faith are settled. Whether the things that are revealed in these scriptures are reasonable or unreasonable according to man's reason, is a matter of no moment. They are from God, and that is an end of it.

But some men seem to take delight in playing with the motes in a sunbeam. They see these, but forget that it is the beam of light that makes them visible. Yet the motes were not there until they stirred up the dust. So the light of revelation is clear and pure until the skepticism of men infuses its doubts and cavils. Such poisons they seem to take pleasure in administering, thinking that when the soul has been tortured well nigh to death with these, it will then have more vital vigor and be better fitted to live than it would have been without it. They have more faith in the conservative and recuperative power of the soul than they have in God's plan of dealing with men. *He* would take the poison away, and give them only his own word. He has not so much faith in humanity, as he has compassion for its condition under sin, and believes that it is far better to give the hungry soul pure bread or pure milk, than impure and adulterated. He would have the soul free from all doubt, the heart free from all care; so that it would come and lay itself on him and find rest from all painful anxiety. So God entreats, and so the aching heart yearns. God takes no pleasure in trying experiments with human nature, to discover how strong faith may become under the leadership of doubt, or how much or rapidly or strongly men may develop in Christian faith on the restless waves of skepticism. He gives truth and light, and would banish all error and darkness from the field of man's vision. But certain wise men—wiser than God—would have the faith of men tried by doubts. They would administer poison to test the strength of the vital force in resisting its mortal tendency. This folly and crime might be excused if the poison of skepticism ever left a soul stronger than it found it.

There are, again, men so liberal, such advocates of free and untrammelled thought, to whom everything resembling prescript-

ive authority is so hateful; to whom the commands "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not," are so extremely distasteful, as wholly unsuited to the manhood of the race, that they leave the young to grow up like weeds in a meadow, exposed to all the evil influences of the world without any special protection from them by the good influences of healthful teaching from the word of God, lest they should, by such instructions and direction, bias their minds. They will have them form their own faith unbiased by anyone. This may be *liberal* Christianity, that timid thing without assertion, without conviction, without a faith; but it is certainly not that taught by Christ and his apostles, nor in accordance with the word of God in any age of the world. • The teaching of the apostle is emphatic on this subject, when he commands (or if you will, advises) Christians to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Because Abraham had the disposition to do this, God was willing to trust him with the knowledge of his purpose to destroy the cities of the plain. This quality of character eminently fitted him to become the father of the faithful in all subsequent time.

The church needs, indeed, more faith and piety, godliness and good works, but nothing of modern criticism. The canon of scripture is closed and settled. The church receives the Scriptures as we now have them. There are no errors of text or translation in them that will injure any soul who receives and yearns for the living bread, and no man, whether of the press or pulpit, has the right to embitter the word of God with reproductions from men styled Modern Critics, but really semi-infidels, if not whole ones. With the great body of the church, all questions relating to the text are settled, and the discussion closed. The scriptures are impregably fortified by ample testimony, their authenticity has been thoroughly canvassed in open court, and a verdict rendered by the almost universal intelligence in their favor. The church should henceforth assert its rights and prerogative, and refuse to reopen the case, or continue the discussion, which would end only with time. To do otherwise will not stop the mouths of infidels, nor silence the public or secret doubters of God's word, whether these are found in the world or in the church, in the pews or in the pulpit. If avowed infidels will continue to blaspheme, let them continue to do so. No answer that a Christian may make, will silence

them. If men will give *them* their ears and not *Christ*, the best that can be done will be to preach the "unsearchable riches of Christ," and the judgments of God on an unbelieving world. Christ is King, teacher, intercessor and the world's atonement. Let this be no longer questioned. The scriptures are God's word, let not this be doubted. The church is a divine institution. Let this be firmly asserted. Let God's declarations be boldly affirmed whether tasteful or distasteful to the carnal heart. Let a positive gospel be proclaimed, and not a timid, sickly sentiment. Let Christ's authority in the church be asserted and enforced, whether men will forbear or not. Let the Gospel be urged pleadingly and men's hearts will be won. Let all attempts at preaching philosophy or a Gospel of Rationalism be discarded, and these sent to the moles and the bats where they belong, and let the apostle's gospel instead be proclaimed persistently, fearlessly, and lovingly, and the church will flourish as in former days.

To unsettle men's faith is a crime; to preach men's opinions is an insult to God's word; to shirk the responsibility which the truth of God imposes is cowardice; and to be chargeable with all these is to merit God's displeasure, and the church's distrust. Only a robust faith will prevent or counteract all these. It will give the church a robust pulpit, and a robust pulpit will give robust pews, and these a living church; and all these will make sinners tremble, God's word honored, the church respected and powerful, and the whole land rejoice in the triumph of truth and righteousness.

H. CHRISTOPHER.

OUR ALTAR OF INCENSE.

Judaism was filled with God's thoughts. To teach the race the unity of Jehovah, to give the world a religious nomenclature, the Hebrews a system of faith and worship, and the ages types of better things, were some of its leading purposes. A divine pattern was followed in the construction of the Tabernacle and its furniture. While the devout Israelite became the recipient of heavenly blessings through its services, its profounder significance is seen and realized in the antitypes of the new covenant.

The Tabernacle as a whole, the most holy and the holy place; the partition vail; the cherubim; the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat; the altar of incense; the table of shew-bread; the candelabrum; the laver; the altar of sacrifices—these were all adumbratives, and give a beautiful pictorial outline of the Christian system. But one of these pieces of furniture, the Altar of Incense, invites our attention in this article.

It was made of accacia wood, overlaid with gold, and was about three feet high and one and a half long and wide. It had a rim of gold around its upper edge. At the four corners were rings of gold, through which were placed two staves of accacia wood, gold-covered, by means of which it was carried by the Kohathites. It also had four gold-covered horns, or projecting corners. Its position was directly before the partition vail. The priests, every morning and evening, were required to burn on this altar sweet incense, composed of equal weights of stacte, onycha, galbanum, and pure frankincense; and the high priest to make the yearly atonement with blood of the sin offering. (Ex. 30:7, 8, 10.) What does all this mean? God's thoughts are not as our thoughts; so we may conclude that there is in this incense altar and its service a profound and far-reaching significance.

The altar indicated the idea that there is a *place* where guilty souls may go and meet with God in peace, enjoying his favor. "O, that I knew *where* I might find him, that I might come even to his seat!" was the cry of a suffering heart in man's early morning,

that fitly symbolizes the yearning of all the children of earth. The Father's answer to this deep want of man was, "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." "I have hallowed this house which thou hast built, to put my name there forever; and mine eye and my heart shall be there perpetually." Thus by the altar of sacrifice and incense did God teach, in type and antitype, that only by blood and prayer could sinners prevail. So it is now written, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin;" "whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my name he will give it you;" for in no other can salvation be found.

The burning of this incense typified the prayers of God's people. "And it came to pass that, while Zacharias executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course, according to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord. And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense." (Lev. 1:8-10.) "Now Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour." (Acts 3:1.) "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." (Psalms 141:2.) Thus intimately associated in the minds of the pious Israelites was the burning incense and the morning and evening prayer. "The four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints." (Rev. 5:8.) This, then, is evident, that God teaches daily prayer offerings from his people in the New Covenant by the daily incense offerings of his people in the Old. Daily worship, not weekly or occasional, is the divine idea and requirement of the Church of Christ. But our relations to material things, the necessary demands made upon our time, and the fulfillment of the obligations growing out of our manifold relationships in the world, are such that the gathering together of the "royal priesthood" twice every day into one place for prayer or worship is an impossibility. How, then, shall this divine requirement for daily worship be met by the people of God? There is and can be but one way, and that is in the daily prayer that is offered in every Christian home. Necessity demands that this be made emphatic. Let this be given by these considerations:—if the sin-offering fore-

shadowed the Lamb of God; the laver, Christian baptism; the holy place the Church; the candelabrum the light of God's word; the shew-bread the soul's food; the most holy place heaven; the priests, members of God's family; and the high priest, Jesus the Christ; that certain is it that the daily incense foreshadowed the daily prayers of the saints. So far as duty is taught herein this is as binding as any other. To annul or neglect one, involves the same disrespect of divine authority as to annul or neglect any other.

Further, let it be noted that the Altar of Incense stood just before the second veil. This was the nearest possible approach of the priest to the Most Holy place, where abode the awful, yet glorious manifestation of Jehovah's presence. The practical yet glorious truth in this antitype is apparent.

From the foregoing considerations it is concluded that our God intended to teach his children in Christ Jesus the duty and privilege of daily worship in every redeemed and sanctified home. What part of the Disciples observe this appointment of heaven is not known. That it is far too generally disrespected by Christian people is sadly true. During one year of travel, in which the writer came in contact with every condition of religious life, he found that only seven out of fifty-eight of the laity, and ten out of eighteen of the preachers, held family worship, and seven of the eight ministers who had no worship in their own homes were secularized. If these figures represent average *per centums* they record a condition of things in the Church of Christ anything but desirable. When ministers are too carnal or careless, lazy or self-righteous to maintain daily devotions in their own homes, the pride of consistency closes their mouths upon the subject in their pulpit ministrations. In such places its neglect is usually and almost universal.

The history of the fulfillment of the types is found in the ministry of Christ and the growth of his Church. Do we find then in this record further proofs of the position herein set forth? Was this conception of the Altar of Incense sanctioned by the teaching of the Master and actualized in the life of the Apostolic church? So the scriptures teach, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:20) Infinite wisdom has subjected the church of Christ to that law of the universe called growth or progress. From infancy to child-

hood, from childhood to youthhood, from youthhood to manhood, is the order of its development. This has been, is yet and must continue to be the law of its life until "the Lord shall have given his anointed the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession;" and, "the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ." Two or three meeting anywhere in Christ's name to worship according to his law and enjoying his promised presence, is a church of Christ in its primary condition. "Greet Priscilla and Aquila

* * likewise the church that is in their house." (Rom. 16:3-5) "Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house." (1 Cor. 16:19) This was in the city of Ephesus, the first Corinthian letter being written from that place. "Salute Nymphas, and the church which is in his house." (Col. 4:15.) "Paul unto Philemon our dearly beloved * * and to the church in thy house. (Phil. 1:2.) Such were some of the conditions of church life in the apostolic age, and in such conditions the church could gather about the home altar lifting up its sweet incense of grateful thanksgiving and importunate supplication. With the increase of the number of disciples in any community came an increase of interests and responsibilities; these necessitating a division of labor, proper officers were chosen. God was worshiped on his holy day in the public assemblies of his people, while all continually and everywhere served as of the ability which God giveth. But the family, God's first institution of humanity, was not destroyed by the introduction of the religio-civil administration of Judaism, nor was civil government by the introduction of Christianity, neither was this fundamental principle of church life, daily home worship, abrogated by the multiplication of the church's membership and the more general character of its more public services. "My house shall be called a house of prayer," and "the house of God is the church of the living God." It is written, "a house of prayer," not of carnality, worldliness or reveling. The first disciples "continued steadfastly in prayer." "Pray without ceasing;" "watch unto prayer;" "continue in prayer;" "praying always in the spirit," are divine requirements that are met by the daily devotions of the closet and the home. So while the Master teaches and we joyfully say, "give us this day our daily bread," we ask not so much for "the food that perisheth as for the food which endureth unto eternal life."

When the foot of Noah stepped from the Ark and first pressed the solid ground, he "builded an altar unto the Lord." When Abram first came into Canaan, and the Lord said unto him, "unto thy seed will I give this land," "then builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him." When the children of the captivity turned their faces toward the setting sun and came back to the homes of their fathers, they first "builded the altar of the God of Israel." The restoration of Apostolic teaching and practice must include the rebuilding of our altars of incense, that are broken down by selfishness, decayed through neglect, and ruined by worldliness. True, the Lamb of God, our sacrifice, has been slain for us, but his blood only becomes efficacious to us at the altar, for not only are we baptized into his death, "calling upon the name of the Lord," but "whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you; hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name; ask, and ye shall receive that your joy may be full." If consistency is to characterize our work in rebuilding the spiritual temple, or God's blessing to attend our labors, then must our efforts be according to the rules of the divine architect.

The necessities of our daily home worship are as manifold as our weaknesses, wants and woes. The "old man" is crucified but not dead and the motions to sin work within us. We are in the world but not of the world. Its vain ambitions, selfish rivalries and wicked strifes surge all about us continually, like a stormy sea. From the fatigue of many cares, the bitterness of many disappointments, and the anguish of many sorrows, that overcast the joyousness of our lives, like the clouds overspreading the sky, we must find rest and refuge beneath the pavilion of the Almighty. The dull routine of daily toil, the burdens of domestic care, the anxieties and perplexities that continually assail the sanctities of home are far easier borne or met by those who daily drink from the sparkling river whose gladsome waters give renewed vigor and immortal youth. "Great peace have they which love thy law."

Particularly and emphatically by the nature and needs of childhood is this duty urged. How much, how very much, of evil, in uttered word and printed page and wicked example is there to-day upon every hand to stain the hearts and mislead the lives of children! To keep them wholly aloof from such influences is simply impossible; hence, their safety is in such training up as will en-

able them not to be overcome by evil, but to overcome evil with good. Not churches, nor schools, nor salons, nor places of public trust or private business, but the homes of this land are the springs whence flow the streams of human life that make up the great sea of American society. This sea of society, in its social and civil, commercial and religious aspects, can never rise higher than the fountains from which its streams come. The regeneration of society, therefore, must be begun in American, and, especially in Christian homes. How? "I know him, that he will *command* his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." (Gen. 18:19.) "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." (Deut. 6:6-7.) "You fathers, provoke not you children to wrath but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6:4.)

By such instruction in his word as God requires, by cheerful song and humble prayer, will the impressible nature of childhood be shaped aright and panopled for the great battle of life. Parental responsibility is a divine doctrine. Shall Christian homes contribute to the sum of sin and human misery? What will your son, your daughter, be in the years to come when the parental roof shall have been left behind, personal parental influence no longer felt, and the world is entered where temptations and allurements, fascinations and seductions sue for the soul. The subtle and unseen influences of home that mould the child's character will then be published before all. If our own children are unsaved, if scores and hundreds, if not thousands, of them are continually going out from the Sunday School and the influences of the Church into indifference, if not into irreligion, what have we to hope for from others? Therefore, respect for divine authority, the peace of our souls and the joy of our hearts, the sanctities of home and the love of children, good will toward society and the hope of heaven, all unite in urging that the Altar of Incense be given its proper and rightful place.

N. S. HAYNES.

REFLECTIONS ON A PAGAN PICTURE OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

The heathen mentions of Christianity are gathered in the standard church histories, and are there accessible to all interested in what they have to say. Probably no one of these testimonies is at once fuller and more graphic than Pliny's testimony, as given in the well-known letter to the Emperor Trajan. He gives, indeed, a picture of primitive Christianity; and the longer one studies it in the light of the author's age, in the light of facts got from other sources, in the perfect light of the New Testament itself, the more fascinating is the view, and the clearer and deeper becomes one's impression of these first days of the Christian Church. I think the picture is worthy of an extended study in a Quarterly article. It is for the reader to judge whether my reflections are fit and instructive.

Pliny, or Pliny the Younger, as he is sometimes called to distinguish him from his celebrated uncle, was a little past forty years of age when he was assigned to the governorship of Bithynia. This was not the first time that a change of sphere, an imposition of unaccustomed burdens, brought out the better stuff a man is made of. The province was suffering from the prevalence of official abuses, wrongs which required at once a ruler of tact and honesty to right. Pliny was primarily a *litterateur*, a gentleman of ease, who enjoyed the luxury of his villa, and had filled with leisurely executiveness successive honorable offices—tribune, præter, augur—when he was sent off to try his hand in a newer and more difficult administration of public duty. It was an old-time lesson of the scholar in politics. He had acquired the fine influence of letters, the "lumen literarum," an intellectual breadth and insight not in vain. His letters to Trajan are the memorials of his faithful and successful governorship.

The province of his administration was Bithynia, a country of Asia Minor, bounded by the Euxine on the north, on the south by Phrygia and Galatia, on the east by Paphlagonia, and on the west

by the Propontic and Mysic.. This name, to the ecclesiastical student, chimes with two important facts—one of apostolic history, as he remembers Paul's attempt "to go into Bithynia" and the refusal of the Spirit to permit it; the other, that in one of its cities, Nicæa, its capitol, the great council of A. D. 325 assembled. It was not permitted Paul on that second missionary journey to preach in Bithynia, and, indeed, we hear of it in the New Testament but once more; we hear of it in Peter's First Epistle, named along with neighboring provinces, where then were "the elect, sojourners of the Dispersion." By Pliny's day of rule, "the infection of this superstition," to quote from his letter, had "swept not only the cities, but also the villages and the country." He came into close contact with the new religion somewhere in the first decade of the second century.

But let us have before our eyes entire his letter to Trajan, and along with it Trajan's reply:

THE LETTER.

"It is my habit, sir, to refer to you all matters about which I am in doubt; for who can better set me right when in doubt, or fill up my lack of knowledge. I have never been at the trials of Christians, and therefore I do not know what punishment, nor how much, is wont to be inflicted, nor what examinations made. And I have been no little perplexed as to whether there shall be any discrimination on account of age, or just where there shall be no distinction between those of tender years and the maturer; whether pardon shall be granted to repentance, or whether to him who has ever been a Christian, it will be of no avail to make retraction; whether the name itself, if it be free from crimes, shall be punished, or the crimes that stick to the name. Meanwhile, in the case of those who have been arraigned before me as Christians, I have followed this plan. I asked them if they were Christians. If they confessed so, I asked them a second and a third time, threatening punishment; if they kept on, I ordered them to be led away to execution. For I had no doubt, whatever it was they professed, that stubbornness and unyielding perverseness ought to be punished. There were others of a like infatuation whom, because they were Roman citizens, I appointed to be sent back to the city. Soon after, as usually turns out, the scandal spreading by this way of handling it, further phases of it came to my knowledge. An

anonymous note was sent in, containing the names of many. Those who denied that they were or had been Christians, when, in my presence, they invoked the gods, and offered sacrifice, with incense and wine, to thy image (which for this purpose I had ordered to be brought in along with the statues of the divinities), besides reviled Christ—none of which things those who are true Christians, it is said, can be forced to do—these I thought ought to be discharged. Others, named by the informer, said they were Christians, and presently denied it; the rest said they had been, but had quit, certain ones many years before, here and there one even twenty years ago. All of them worshipped thy image and the statues of the gods, and cursed Christ. Now they say that this had been the height of their blame or error, that they had been accustomed to come together on a fixed day before light, and to sing by turns a song to Christ as to God,* and to bind themselves by an oath, not for any piece of wickedness, but not to commit theft, nor robbery, nor adultery, not to break a promise, nor deny a trust when called upon for it; that after these transactions they had been accustomed to separate, and to come together again to eat a social and harmless meal; that they had ceased to do this after my edict, in which, according to thy commands, I had forbidden secret brotherhoods. I thought it all the more necessary, therefore, to get the truth, even by torture, out of two female slaves, who were said to be deaconesses. I could find nothing except a vicious and unbridled superstition. And so I put off the examination, and hasten to consult you. For it seems to me a case requiring instruction, especially on account of the number of those involved in these risks, since many of every age, of every rank, and of both sexes, are cited and will be cited for trial. The infection of this superstition has swept not only the cities, but

*It matters but little whether we render "quasi deo" "as to God," or "as to a God," as far as the idea of such worship was in the minds of the worshipers. Pliny may not have had the full idea of the God of the Bible in saying that the "Christ" of the worshipers was so worshiped. The importance of the statement is not in view of the historian's intellectual sweep of testimony, but that such a fact is so recorded; and the simple question is, can the Divinity of Jesus of Nazareth be consistently understood short of the absoluteness of Trinitarian doctrine? "That the 'carmen' was an incantation, or that Christ was saluted as a hero, not as a Divine Person, are glosses upon the sense of this passage, rather than its natural meaning." (Lidden, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 391.)

also the villages and the country. It seems to me that it can be checked and cured. It is plain enough that the temples, almost left desolate, again begin to be thronged, and the sacred rites, so long given up, are resought after, and food for victims is sold, of which till late was a buyer rarely found. From this it is easy to conjecture what a crowd of persons may be reclaimed, if a place is found for repentance."

THE EMPEROR'S REPLY.

"You have followed the right course, my Pliny, in trying the cases of the Christians arraigned before you. For it is not possible to settle on any general rule which can have, as it were, a fixedness of application. They are not to be sought after; if they are arraigned and convicted, they are to be punished; so, however, that he who denies that he is a Christian, and shall prove that he is not by invoking our gods, shall get pardon for his penitence, although suspicioned as to the past. Anonymous accusations ought not to have a place in any criminal case. This is to set a dangerous precedent, and is not at one with the spirit of our age."

Without doubt the first thought that comes to our minds on reading this letter is a sad one—the thought of the persecutions which the early Christians suffered. An infinite pathos touches the modern heart as we read of the "noble army of martyrs" who by thousands upon thousands gave up their lives for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus. We think of the long, long time, three entire centuries, along whose years, with occasional breaks, is traced the blood of men and women who suffered for Christ. It is only by the hardest effort that we can calm ourselves, and in historic self-possession study these horrible chapters, and patiently look at things just as they were. Such a study yields its invaluable lessons, creating a healthy intellectual temper which tells even in the simplest matters of everyday conduct, leading us into a foretaste of God's final and exact judgment, and really linking us in tighter bonds of charity to our common humanity. This tendency of the modern historical student has certainly had its perversions in attempts to reverse age-long verdicts on men and events; but the tendency itself is a wholesome one, and truth, whether of confirmation or limitation or reversal, is bound at last to prevail.

I think this letter of Pliny is one of the strongest appeals to the historical mind for exact justice on the conflict of Christianity

with heathenism. Here is the simple fact of a mild-mannered Pagan brought into contact with a new religion. With him a new religion means not only opposition to the old religion of his fathers and his own, but an assailment of the state with which the old religion is bound up. Christianity was making that assailment, not violently, but determinedly nevertheless. Sons were at variance against fathers, daughters against mothers, daughters-in-law against mothers-in-law; a man's foes had become those of his own household, and he appeared to be also the household's foe. The disciples of the Nazarene had flung off Polytheism; but Polytheism was the religion of the state, sanctioned by august laws and practiced amid august ceremonies, and charges of atheism and impurity therefore began to fill the air. Slanders against the Christians were springing up like Jonah-gourds at every legal crossing where Jupiter and Caesar met. The simple meetings of the Christians were looked upon with dire suspicion on account of their secrecy and exclusiveness. Reports were abroad that they banqueted on human flesh amid gloating songs.

These were the difficulties that beset the humane and scholarly Pliny. He was in doubt how to act. It is not the picture of an inquisitorial officer hunting down his victims and dragging them to a torturous death. It was a genuine case of legal perplexity, a doubt as to what course he should pursue that would get a superior judicial sanction. Our study and judgment must be very exact just here. He is aiming to act with the fidelity of a Roman officer to his government in the case of those who seemed to have rebelled against the government. He punishes with death those who persist in their profession of the new religion. His secondary reason for this is most pathetic in its show of official fidelity and pride—"I had no doubt, whatever it was they professed, that stubbornness and unyielding perverseness ought to be punished." "Stubbornness and unyielding perverseness" in the light of the Roman law, the heroism of martyrdom under the impulse of Christianity! Through all the first part of the letter we see traces of the hesitancy of personal humaneness to carry out official rigor—the perplexities as to the kind and degree of punishment, as to the discrimination between those of tender years and the maturer, as to the guilt of the mere profession, or of the consequences of the profession. Trajan's reply accords with this tone

of mildness, as far as the mildness reigns outside of legal requisitions. The Christians are not to be hunted down; any man's information is not to be acted upon. But the Roman law is inexorable. The conviction of a profession of the new religion, which assailed Polytheism, which broke with the innumerable social customs hedged by religious rites, which had its novel meetings where bread was eat, and a song was sung in honor of the divinity whom the bread was said to represent—the conviction of such a persuasion and such doings bore sentence, and the sentence, when it was full-grown, brought forth death.

The lesson, therefore, of the first part of this letter is the attitude of the intellectual Pagan towards the advance of Christianity. We see how he acted under governmental rigor; but his very acting there was subtly stimulated by the popular breath of contempt for the new religion. The grave and satirical Tacitus pronounces on the Christians the heavy judgment *per flagitia invisos*, "hated for their crimes;" *odio humani generis convicti*, "convicted of hating the human race;" and Pliny calls the profession *superstitionem pravam immodicam*, "a vicious and unbridled superstition." Prevalent judgments were all against Christianity. As regards government, it was rebellious, as regards society, it was a subverter of morals; as regards philosophy, it was a superstition. There was one thing more—the saddest of all—that made against it, and helped in these adverse judgments—the conduct of many of its professors—their going back on their profession, their turning secret informers against their sometime brethren. Christianity has always suffered more from within than from without—from the intellectual confusion of its teachers, the moral lapses of its members, than from infidel attacks or governmental persecutions. The blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the Church; but heresy and immorality have been its blight. And yet, with all the allowance that the historic conscience approves as respects the mitigating circumstances of the persecutions of the early Christians, we can but feel a profound regret that such men as Pliny, Tacitus, Marcus Aurelius—men of calm intellectual discernment, of mild manners, of noble moral motives—should not have seen further into the genius of Christianity. Our indignation may be fitly poured out upon a Nero and a Domitian, who were excessively bad as Pagans, and whose personal lust

gloated at the sight of Christian blood; but for the Emperor who could say, "They are not to be hunted down;" for another Emperor, a persecutor, indeed, who yet made goodness a life-long study, and could write in his diary, with stoical sadness, "It would be a man's happiest lot to depart from mankind without having had any taste of lying and hypocrisy and luxury and pride"—for these we feel like repeating the pathetic words, "If thou hadst known in this day, even then, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes." But that was the uphill business, that Christianity had—to work itself to that point where it could commend itself to every man's intellect in the sight of philosophy; but to begin that work, it must begin at the bottom of society, where the moral need was deepest, and where alone success could promise the final transformation of philosophic thought and the topmost civilization. There it must work, and with that leaven—the death of its Founder for human rise—which was a stumbling-block to some, and foolishness to others. With these facts before us, in the broad light of a true historic judgment, how sublimely reasonable are the words of Paul, "For behold your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many nobles, are called; but God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise; and God chose the weak things of the world, that he might put to shame the things that are strong; and the base things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose, yea and the things that are not, that he might bring to naught the things that are; that no flesh shall glory before God."

Let us now proceed to look at the more inviting parts of this Pagan picture of primitive Christianity—the view it gives us of the primitive Christians in their church worship and morals, their creed and their practice. It was shortly after the death of the last Apostle; the place was Bithynia, a rugged country, hard to travel about in on account of mountain ranges and thick standing forests; the government was upon the shoulders of a Roman officer. Before him had been arraigned professors of the new religion, who tell what had long been the customs of the Christians—"the height of their blame or error." Let us see what they have to say, according to the record of this important witness.

*Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius—Long's Translation, P 230.

We read that "they had been accustomed to come together on a fixed day before light." It was the Lord's Day. Of this there can be no doubt whatever. The Pagan wrote more wisely than he was aware of. He photographs one of the customs of these Bithynian Christians which looks just like a picture in the Book of Acts—"and upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread." It is by such touches as these—one Apostolic, from the inside; the other Pagan, from the outside—that we get the sanction, the significance, the high and broad spiritual beginning of the Lord's day. The old theological argument for sabbatizing is almost dead. Impartial study and critical exegesis have pronounced unsound all attempts to merge the authoritativeness of the old Jewish Sabbath in the Christian first day of the week. Judaism and Christianity—the difference between the two—the fact of it has at last dawned upon the eyes of a critical scholarship; and the fine, prophetic generalizations of Alexander Campbell on Moses and Christ—the coming of the law by Moses, the coming of grace by Christ—have been justified to the minutest particulars. Arguments for the existence and prevalence of the Sabbath from Eden to Sinai are altogether in the air, and the logical "therefore" will not embody itself in the definite statue, nor particular example, nor downright conclusion. The New Testament cuts loose from all Judaic observances, and sets out from the authority of Christ with a total ignoring of Mosaic precept on the subject. Heb. 4:9 will burst the wine-skin of any argument which aims to pour its vital, far-flowing idea into the observance of an earthly day. There is no need now to point out to the English reader that it is impossible to find any teaching blending the Sabbath and the Lord's Day; impossible to find an Apostolic examples carrying over the Sabbatic idea into the observance of the first day of the week; impossible to find the merest hint that indicates the fundamental obligation of the great Jewish day on the Christian. Nor is it necessary, interesting though it be, to quote the numerous passages gathered from the patristic writers, showing their sense of the difference, not connection, between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day—not one of them going back to Moses to get authority for the Christian memorial. For in the correct translation of the Revised Version of Col. 2:16, all sabbatizing is swept out of sight—"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in

drink, or in respect of a feast day, or a new moon or a *Sabbath Day*"—is swept out of sight by this Pauline handling of the principles of Christian liberty.

But while the letter of Mosaism dissolves, the spirit of Christianity prevails, and in the first day celebration at Troas, and in the assembly, "on a fixed day," of the Christians amid the rugged forests of Bithynia, we trace the working of the leaven which, in its spiritual freeness, can adapt itself to climate, to government, to society, to race—in the perpetual memorial of Christianity's central fact—the resurrection of the Lord. This fine spiritual observance of a new day, not going back to Moses for a statutory precept, may yet acknowledge the agreeable principles wrapped up in Christ's saying, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath;" may listen with reverence to the old time declaration, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sun, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath Day, and hallowed it;" may, in a free, literary way, even say the Christian Sabbath, allowing the imagination thus to picture one of the features of the Lord's day, when everybody's eyes are open to its non-Mosaic origin and sanction; may admit the light of every ethnical hieroglyphic which reveals a seventh day rest elsewhere than in Judea; may thank a Proudhon * for his luminous scientific arguments in behalf of such a seventh day rest for all mankind. All these collaterals of Script-

*The passage is quoted by Pres. Seelye in his article "The Sabbath Question" in the *Princeton Review* for Nov. '80. It is worth quotation here. "What statistician could have first discovered that in ordinary times the period of labor ought to be to the period of rest in the ratio of six to one. Moses then, having to regulate in a nation the labors and the days, the rests and the festivals, the toils of the body and the exercises of the soul, the interest of hygiene and of morals, political economy and personal subsistence, had recourse to a science of numbers, to a transcendental harmony which embraced all space, duration, movements, spirits, bodies, the social and the profane. The certainty of the science is demonstrated by the result. Diminish the work by a single day, the labor is insufficient relatively to the repose; augment it in the same quantity, it becomes excessive. Establish every three days and a half a half-day of relaxation, you multiply by the breaking of the day the loss of time, and in shattering the natural unity of the day you break the numerical equilibrium of things. Accord, on the contrary, forty-eight hours of repose after twelve consecutive days of labor, you kill the man by inertia, after having exhausted him by fatigue."

ure allusions of literary touches, of historical hints, of scientific confirmations, Christianity does not turn its back upon; for Christianity can afford to welcome all such offerings of hint or proof that make for universal good, while itself always free, fluent, eluding the vice of a syllogism in any final analysis of its infinite helpfulness, universally adaptive, universally condesensive, universally progressive as regards mere customs or manners. The Bithynian Christians had to come together before light; they were slaves; the day was not their own; before the light of the morning they assembled for worship and edification, and separated to serve their heathen masters while the sun was shining, to reassemble after dark "to eat a social and harmless meal." A nineteenth century Christian, at least one of spiritual maturity, living a free man in the comfort of modern civilization, hails the light of the Lord's Day, abstains from secular work, goes to church at midday to break bread and hear the Gospel, spends an hour or two in holy meditation, does good by teaching in a mission school or visiting the sick and needy, and closes the day, rested in body and elevated in spirit. So broad was Christianity, in Apostolic teaching, for a poor Bithynian Christian; so finely obligatory is it to the heart and conscience of a modern disciple. The sanctity of the Lord's Day, yes, its involvement of age-long convictions, its undeniable blessedness to a great need of human nature—this we learn best, not from Mosaism, but from Troas and Bithynia—from the very limitations through which Christianity was working to create a noble privilege for the disciple of Christ.

We pass on to the details of that primitive worship of the Bithynian Christians. The picture becomes more and more interesting. One is inevitably set to thinking as one studies it. They had the custom of singing "by turns a song to Christ as to God." The singing of the early Christians was no doubt a barren art compared with the richness of modern church music. Singing after the Apostolic manner, after the manner of Pliny's prisoners, would hardly be tolerated nowadays. The developments of music the Church has claimed for herself, as she utilizes the developments of philosophy, of political economy, of philanthropic methods, of financial customs, of arctitectural plans—of anything and everything that will make for her spiritual good and her territorial spreading. But the historical student, in looking at this part

of Pliny's picture, will not stop for any commiserative comparisons of the music of the primitive Church with the music of a modern cathedral. We stop long enough to see those devoted disciples gathered in the early dawn, perhaps in some secret retreat, and in simple recitative pronouncing their psalm responsively, an echo of the manner of the synagogue. Simple, however, as was their art of singing, the song had a great idea, the fact of which is worth no little in the study of the person and office of Jesus Christ. They sang "a song to Christ as to God."

It is quite the fashion of this age to deprecate all speculation and dogmatism in theology. We hear the advice on every hand to let the intellectual analysis of Christianity alone, and to confine ourselves to simple facts and precepts and promises, and to the practical exemplification of the spirit of Christ. But the trouble is, this element of Christianity will not let us alone. Knowledge, as well as faith, has a place in Christian experience; and the intellect can not honestly dodge the problems which this phase necessarily brings up. The humblest Christian has some theory of his religious life, though it may be very crude or held almost unconsciously. The supply of knowledge, that is, of intellectual discrimination and information in one's faith, is necessary to keep one's faith healthy, and to broaden one's enjoyment of one's religion. Nay, the very spread of Christianity, not simply as an evangelical mission, but as a humanizing influence, has always followed ages of intellectual enrichment. The point to be deprecated is that the Church honestly, though mistakenly, did not mark the difference between the Gospel and a philosophy of the Gospel—between its infinite life, and finite formulations of that life—did not mark this difference, but confounding the two, imposed human and fallible deductions on men as tests of fellowship and bonds of union. The most signal instance, the first as well as the most signal, was in the discussions that centered on the person of Christ. Deep lessons in that controversy are yet to be learned; the deepest question, could the issue, humanly speaking, have been otherwise than in the determined stand which the Church took amid the chafing confusions of heresies? It is all well enough, in the present day of wider light, after long ages of trial, to see how the widest liberty of thought can be allowed among those who believe in their hearts that Jesus Christ is the son of the living God, and breadth of in-

tellectual formulation allowed, too, as one's faith blossoms in beauty of character and in the fruitage of good works. But the fourth century was not the nineteenth century. There were no paths of experience to look back upon. It was the exploration of an unknown trust which Plato never dreamed of—the intellectual examination of the sublimest fact which ever spread out before the human mind—the Incarnation of Almighty God.

Our final judgment of the course of the Church in this matter may be tempered with mercy, though it is now fast growing into loud condemnation that any one set of men shall impose on their fellow men human creeds as conditions of Divine favor or official recognition. That practice will soon be done away with; and the sooner, the better for Protestantism. But intellectual examinations and intellectual statements will always have a place in Christian experience, and right reason will spread with the Kingdom of God. Such burdens cannot be finally shirked. Now the simple and practical question, for instance, as to the person of Christ, is, what is your best intellectual formulation of your faith and experience as a disciple of the Nazarene? Those Bithynian Christians, while the Apostle John was living, used to meet and sing "a song to Christ as to God." The joy of their salvation overflowed in praise; the heart beat harder than the head thought—but they had this simple idea before them, or rather their minds simply held on to this vast idea, "a song to Christ as to God." This disinterested report of a literary Pagan, as he caught it from the lips of simple-minded Christians of the Apostolic day—the report of the vital part of their faith—how much it involves! How like the New Testament! There we find no definite formulations of the relations of the Father and the Son. The language is not hard, rigid, scientific, but free, fluent, pliable. Trinitarian and Unitarian can debate it all day, and their last words will leave something unexplained. But the deeper question is, can the doctrine of the New Testament as to the person of Christ become the fulness of Christian experience, can Christ become to our hearts all that He was to Paul and John and these Bithynian mountaineers, and our intellectual expression of this union and communion with Jesus of Nazareth as Redeemer, Life, Love, Light, and Lord, be other than the ascription of that primitive heartfelt song—so simple, so profound—"a song to Christ as to God?" This, therefore, is the les-

son from this part of Pliny's picture—the vitality of Christian experience finding its simplest verbal outcome. We need never fear the loftiest and most sweeping language as to the person of Christ, if it be chaste, reverent, and truly philosophical—the noble consistency of mind, heart and conscience—if only the fulness of religious experience is back of it all.

The next phase of Pliny's picture is deeply significant. In that stated meeting of the Bithynian Christians, where religion voiced itself in songs of praise, the obligations of morality were not forgotten. They had a most distinct recognition. These primitive worshipers bound themselves "by an oath, not for any piece of wickedness, but not to commit theft, nor robbery, nor adultery, not to break a promise nor deny a trust when called upon for it." The demands of Christianity, the religion of the most mystical faith, could not have a simpler show in their influence on the conscience than there in that humble meeting of its professors, as, drawing close together in the fleeing shadows of the night, they looked solemnly into each other's eyes, and spoke aloud their sense of duty for the day before them. So did the Gospel begin its transformation of human conduct.

Let us look at this lesson somewhat in detail. The knowledge of the wretched moral condition of the Pagan world at the advent of Christ, is now a familiarity. We need not depend on Paul's indictment in the first chapter of Romans. We can judge Paganism out of its own mouth—in the hissing indignation of Juvenal; in the melancholy echoes of Tacitus; in the sad accents of Seneca, in the sportive effusions of Apuleius; in the dainty lips of Petrovius; and, last of all, in the breathing silence of Pompeii. Amid the prevalent darkness, a little of good lingered in the twilight of Stoicism; but it was the twilight of the evening, which night would soon follow; and the world needed another morning, and the light of a new sun. Christianity was the light. And the simple secret of the first triumphs of Christianity over individual morals was its redemptive influence—its intense movement around the roots of character, delivering men from the pain and power of sin. Here surely is the core of the Christian religion, which, when once penetrated and understood, makes all the radiations and affiliations of Christianity intelligible, willingly concedes whatever of truth and good there was in the world before Paul preached on Mar's Hill,

just as willingly accepted whatever of truth and good it met in its spread among the nations, and so as a supernatural revelation, going along with and yet transcending reason, justifies itself to any man's conscience in the sight of God. This very redemptive influence, issuing from Christ's death and resurrection, purifies indeed all such occasions, and so always keeps its authoritative tone; but if historical criticism cannot see and maintain this vital peculiarity of the Gospel, with its voice of moral authority, then a theory of esthetic naturalism is as sure to prevail as that its advocates are becoming bolder and more numerous every day. So permanent does Christianity become, that it is rather an indolence of intellectual habit, than an inevitable philosophical decision, that will not trace these far-reaching moral effects back to their evangelical origin. But the overthrow of Paganism demands an explanation; the superiority of Christian morality, its intensity, its uncompromisingness, its absoluteness, along with its tenderness and pitifulness, must have a rationale. A wealth of facts are before us. Let us turn to Justin Martyr, of the second century, who challenges the sharpest criticism to consider the morality of the Church in his time:

"We who formerly delighted in fornication now embrace chastity alone. We who formerly used magical arts, dedicate ourselves to the good and unbegotten God. We who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions, now bring what we have into a common stock, and communicate to every one in need. We who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not live with men of a different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them, and pray for our enemies, and endeavor to persuade those who hate us unjustly to live conformably to the good precepts of Christ, to the end that they may become partakers with us of the same joyful hope of a reward from God, the ruler of all." *

More deeply interesting for its details, as well as for its admirable spirit and eloquent style, is the picture given by the unknown author of the *Epistle to Diognētus*.

"For the Christians are distinguished from other men neither by country, nor language, nor the customs which they observe. For they neither inhabit cities of their own, nor employ a peculiar

**Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. II. p. 17.

form of speech, nor lead a life which is marked out by any singularity. The course of conduct which they follow has not been devised by any speculation or deliberation of inquisitive men; nor do they, like some, proclaim themselves the advocates of any merely human doctrines. But, inhabiting Greek as well as barbarian cities, according as the lot of each of them has determined, and following the customs of the natives in respect to clothing, food, and the rest of their ordinary conduct, they display to us their wonderful and confessedly paradoxical method of life. They dwell in their own countries, but simply as sojourners. As citizens, they share in all things with others, and yet endure all things as if foreigners. Every foreign land is to them as their native country, and every land of their birth as a land of strangers. They marry, as do all [others]; they beget children; but they do not destroy their offspring. They have a common table, but not a common bed. They are in the flesh, but they do not live after the flesh. They pass their days on earth, but they are citizens of heaven. They obey the prescribed laws, and at the same time surpass the laws by their lives. They love all men, and are persecuted by all. They are unknown and condemned; they are put to death, and restored to life. They are poor, yet make many rich; they are in lack of all things, and yet abound in all; they are dishonored, and yet in their very dishonor are glorified. They are evil spoken of, and yet are justified; they are reviled, and bless; they are insulted, and repay the insult with honor; they do good, yet are punished as evil-doers. When punished, they rejoice as if quickened into life; they are assailed by the Jews as foreigners, and are persecuted by the Greeks; yet those who hate them are unable to assign any reason for their hatred." *

It is impossible not to be struck with the singular moral freshness of these facts, their quick appearance and rapid spread in the world, their glaring contrast with the decay of Heathenism. The Gospel is their simple explanation—the new life which the mercy of God in Christ poured down into human hearts. "We who died to sin, how shall we live any longer therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were baptized therefore with him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through

**Anti-Nicene Library*, vol. I. p. 307-8.

the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." Reason will look in vain, in the desolation of Paganism, for naturally recuperative forces. The regeneration of the ancient world came by the Gospel; and the Gospel is the good news of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. And it was these facts, with what they promised of pardon and peace, that men believed in their hearts, and so began life anew. And it was their faith in the presence of an unseen though living God, which gave a peculiar character to all the moralities of life, suffusing them with sweetness, filling them with light, and encircling the halo of hope around the pains of martyrdom. Evermore those primitive Christians recognized in their lives the fact of influences from above—"ὕπὸ τῆς ἀνωθεν βοήθουμένης ῥοπῆς," "helped by help from on high," * as the mother of Chrysostom said amid tears, as she expostulated with her son, and revealed the secret of her widowhood's peace and trust. Their report of that fact found expression in the language of the New Testament, or in language like that. It always involved the idea of a new moral access in the hearts of men. It was in Bithynia, on Lord's Day mornings before sunrise, that slaves came together, and sang in tune a song to Christ as to God, and bound themselves in Christ's name to flee Pagan lusts and lead honest lives. Could modern Puritanism have induced them to do this? Could it have put a song into their hearts?

Still another item of early Christian practice is noticed by the Roman governor, as testified by his prisoners. After that morning service the worshipers were "accustomed to separate, and to come together again to eat a social and harmless meal." It was the *agape*, or love-feast, as all the historians decide. There are undeniable traces of such a custom in the New Testament. It grew out of the hallowing influences of Christianity on the common ways of life. The word itself is not found till late in the Apostolic times—in the Second Epistle of Peter (11.13),† in the Epistle of Jude (ver. 12). But what the word there stands for, indicating a fixed observance of the churches in the lives of Peter and Jude, we can

**De Sacerdotio*, II. 15.

†There is some uncertainty in the text here. In the Revised Version the English Committee retain *agapais*; but the American Revisers decide for, *apatais*, "deceivings," which, on the whole, seems to have the weight of authority. But the reading in Jude is untouched.

see plain signs of, clear back to the beginning in Jerusalem. "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as every man had need. And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." There is no need to be pedantic to quote the like custom of the Essenes in their coverts on the shores of the Dead Sea, nor the *ἑταῖροι* of the Athenians, nor the *συσσίτια* of the Spartans. These were the outcroppings of the social instincts of men, conditioned and characterized by such and such times and places. It is a beautiful and holy custom for Christians to sit down and break bread together, receiving the good gifts of God and sanctifying them through His Word and prayer. What was hilarity and extravagance with the Greeks, became reverence and moderation with the primitive Christians in their social meals; and the hallowedness of such prevalent intercourse was made pure to the last degree as it led up to breaking bread and drinking wine, and so remembering, and more than remembering, so communing with, their Savior and Lord. But man soon spoils his privileges; and in Paul's time, and in one of Paul's churches, this custom had become sadly abused. It was at Corinth (I. Cor. XI.) that this simple custom had been turned into a selfish and licentious indulgence. The rich feasted; the poor looked on with envious eyes and hungry stomachs; some showed the effects of too much wine. Augustine tells the beautiful story that, in his day, his saintly mother Monica would go to the *agapae* with a basket of good things, of which she barely tasted, and then kindly gave its contents to others. Paul tells the Corinthians to wait for one another in the share of this common meal, the communal meaning of which is the uppermost thing, and to let mere hunger and thirst have their rights at home. The simple custom found its way to rugged Bithynia, and in Pliny's time it was "a social and harmless meal," already separated from the Lord's Supper. That was a providential stroke; for the *agapae* became more and more abused as the centuries rolled by. The question of caste disturbed its social equilibrium. It was either a feast for the rich or a charity for the poor. At Alexandria, for instance, about the close of the second century, the custom had become a banquet, and songs of a

secular, rather than a religious kind, were sung to the sound of the flute. Clement hotly protested against such an abuse, and advises the participants to break off such secular wildness, and to return to religious moderation. Their songs should be songs of thanksgiving and praise, accompanied by the harp or lyre, as to the use of which there could be no blame.* But the *agapae* had been too far perverted ever to recover in that age their Apostolic simplicity. They came under the ban of council after council, and finally languished and died. The Moravians and the Methodists have revived something that looks like the primitive custom. They have Apostolic examples, and chapter and verse, for it. But the *agapae* will never again have their primitive prevalence.

It is hardly possible to learn from all this a more important lesson than the fact of the vitality of "the faith" and its Christ-appointed ordinances, as contrasted with mere shifting customs and social institutions. And we would not wish a better inductive study of undeniable facts to whet one's discriminative faculty in deciding what a return to Apostolic Christianity really means—in seeing vividly what "the faith" is, what the eternal precepts of righteousness which Christianity backed up with new motives, what the mere shifting customs and social institutions that Christianity accidentally came in contact with, sensibly carried along awhile, and finally flung aside.

There is one more item to consider—an item of real interest—the characterization of the women whom the Roman governor put to the torture. He calls them "ministrae." This word, after careful study, I have, with strong persuasion, but not with full conviction, translated "deaconesses." This rendering, it seems to me, gets nearest at the sense for the modern English reader. The fact as to the existence, in the Apostolic age, of female helpers, workers, call them what you please, must, in the light of the New Testament, be candidly admitted. Nor must the understanding of it be taken only in the general sense, that all Christians were expected to do something for the sake of the Gospel, and that all such mentions of women are but singling out specimens of what many others were doing. We may half close our eyes to the marginal alterna-

* "And even if you wish to sing simply to the harp and lyre, there is no blame. Thou shalt imitate the righteous Hebrew King in his thanksgiving to God."—*Ante-Nicene Library*, vol. IV. p. 217.

tive of the Revised Version at Rom. XVI. 1—"Phœbe our sister, who is a deaconess of the church that is at Cenchreæ"—if by that alternative the Revisers mean that Phœbe occupied one of the permanent offices of Apostolic appointment. But the verse certainly means that she was fulfilling a special assignment of the congregation where she had membership. So, too, in verse 12, three women loom up—"Tryphæna and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord," and "Persis the beloved, who labored much in the Lord"—whose work, therefore, must have been not simply a beneficence as occasions drifted in their reach, but a steady running after opportunities to do good. Again, the Revisers have given us "women" instead of "wives" at I Tim. III. 11, a change* which seems rightly to outweigh the old translation, and to confirm the theory at least of special works of women in that day after approval and under appointment, if they did not labor after formal ordination like that of bishops and deacons through the settledness of an Apostolic office. I do not think that the passage about the enrollment of widows yields so much for the theory of an office of deaconess as some (Schaff notably, and plausibly) labor to prove. I Tim. 2:9, 10, only show that certain women did then give themselves to specialties and continuities of good works. There was a demand for such womanly consecration in work. The social position of women in that age demanded it. Women then could serve women in ways that the growth of a Christian civilization does not make so necessary now; and we see that undoubtedly the women of the Church did so devote themselves in a breadth and singleness and persistency of service that got distinct Apostolic mention and distinct Apostolic approval.

This is the upshot of the question, and it is as far as we can

*Ellicott, with his admirable exegetical tact, deserves to be quoted here: "When we observe the difference of class to which *oosantoos* seems to point (ver. 8, chap. II. 9, Tit. II. 3, 6),—the omission of *autoon*,—the order and parallelism of qualifications in ver. 8 and 11, coupled with the suitable change of *diologous* to *diabolous*, and the substitution of *pistas en pasin* for the more specific *aischrok* (deaconesses were probably almoners, but in a much less degree),—the absence of any notice of the wives of *episkopoi*,—and lastly the omission of any special notice of domestic duties, though it follows (ver. 12) in the case of the men, we can scarcely avoid deciding with Chrysostom, most ancient and several modern expositors (Wiesler, Alford, Wordsworth, et al.), that '*diaconisse*' are here alluded to." A sentence to be "chewed and digested!"

go without undue dogmatism. One cannot go the length of affirming confidently the existence of an office of deaconess with regular and formal ordination like that of bishops and deacons; and yet it is an offense to the intellectual man to deny outright the probability of such a thing. *Adhuc sub judice lis est—the question is still undecided.* But when there is such specialty and continuity of labor anywhere, it will make for itself a specialty and permanence of name in spite of you. Things go that way without asking leave of any one. It is an inevitable tendency which a law of the human mind sooner or later sets in motion. There may still be, in fine conservance with Apostolic Christianity, women who work through the Church, with its approval and appointment, in special behoofs of humanity. In the New Testament we read of such; in the last tides of the Apostolic age, as we read in Pliny's letter, there were such. He says they were called "ministræ;" Rom. XVI. 1 says that a woman, thus serving a church in some specialty, at least, of work, was its *διάκονος*; and skipping over the Latin, we may simply transliterate the Greek, and call her "deaconess." And women so serving churches nowadays, as with all right and propriety women may still so work, we may, not with the absoluteness of official designation, but with the dictate merely of literary tact so agreeable to the fitness of things, call them "deaconesses." And in such absence of dogmatism, but with the following of such Apostolic example, we learn something further in that lesson whose full meaning is yet to be learnt—the united solidity and pliability of Apostolic church polity—that at the core, with its congregational independence, it is firm against every plan and practice of men that lands in Sacerdotalism, but firm there, allows, in its issues of evangelical progress and philanthropic schemes, any plan and practice that the wisdom of Christians may harmoniously decide upon.

But Pliny was decidedly wrong in one judgment. He thought that the "superstition" could be "checked and cured." He assures Trajan that "the temples, almost left desolate, again begin to be thronged." It was the first spasm of a moribund Paganism. Christianity went on sweeping the cities and the villages and the country. The years of doom came swiftly flying, and the heathen oracle was at last fulfilled:

εἶπατε τῷ βασιλῇ, χαμαὶ πέσε δαίδαλος ἀύλα
 οὐκέτι φοῖβος ἔχει καλύβαν, οὐ μάντιδα δάφνην,
 οὐ παγὰν λαλέουσιν ἀπίσβετο καὶ λάλον ὕδωρ.

"Tell the king, on earth has fallen the glorious dwelling,
 And the water springs that spake are quenched and dead.
 Not a cell is left the God, no roof, no cover;

In his hand the prophet laurel flowers no more.
 And the great king's high sad heart, thy true last lover,
 Felt thine answer pierce and cleave it to the core,

But he bowed down his hopeless head
 In the drift of the wide world's tide,
 And dying, *Thou hast conquered*, he said,
Galilean; he said it, and died."

ROBERT T. MATHEWS.

AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW (Published by Randolph & Co., N. Y.) for July somewhat excels itself in interesting articles. We give its *Table of Contents*: 1. Recent Ethical Theory, by W. E. Hamilton; 2. Is the Advent Pre-Millennial, by Prof. Samuel H. Kellogg; 3. Biblical Theology, by Prof. Charles A. Briggs; 4. Alexander Campbell and the Disciples, by E. F. Hatfield; 5. Delitzsch on the Origin and Composition of the Pentateuch, by Prof. Samuel Ives Curtiss.

The article, *Biblical Theology*, induces me to say, that the tendency is too much in the direction of making the *human* mind the mentor of the divine will. The author of the essay has read so much of German metaphysics that he has apparently lost sight of the fact that the Bible is a book to be received, not to be criticised. I do not mean by this, that we must believe every word and phrase in our King James' Version, and that we must not study it so as to arrive at an intelligent understanding of its contents; but what I mean is, that we have no right to attempt to decide whether a certain statement is inspired or not by measuring it by any opinion of ours as to whether or not God would or should have so spoken. It is legitimate and obligatory that we should determine as to the canonicity of a particular writing and to the correct text, but further than this we should not go. Most of the German critics, and I mention them because they are less reverent in their investigations than others, would probably claim nothing more, but when I limit the investigation of the question of canonicity to historic evidence, they would object. If you take away from a German critic the privilege of internal and philosophical criticism, his occupation is gone. In the latter he can be much more learned (?) than in the former; and I imagine that they find many imitators in this country on this account. I never undertake the reading of any of their works, (and I am free to confess that this does not happen very often—life is too short), without being reminded of the old Scotch woman's definition of "metaphysics."

When asked how she liked a certain minister, she expressed much delight and satisfaction from his pulpit ministrations, "he was so metaphysical;" and when asked what she understood by "metaphysics," answered that "when a man preached what she did not understand, and what he did not understand himself, that was metaphysics, and that was what gave her comfort."

When the professors in the Theological Schools read and lecture more about the "progress of German criticism," than they do about the Bible, it is reasonable to expect a decline in personal piety and successful evangelizing. The preacher who reads only enough of Biblical investigation to satisfy himself of the canonicity of the New Testament and the correct text, will do much more good and be far more successful in winning souls to Christ, than he who has the jargon of these critics glibly on his tongue. This study of the *critics* leads the student away from Bible thoughts, sentiments and language, and to illustrate we make several quotations. He speaks of "the various Christian churches." From my study of the Bible I learn of only one "Christian Church." Christ says "upon this rock I will build my Church." It is also said "feed the church of the Lord, which he purchased with his own blood;" "Christ is the head of the Church." It is true in our English translations we have "Churches," the plural form, but all admit that the term refers to separate congregations. The writer does not use it in this sense, but in the sense that the various separate religious organizations are equally to be regarded as the true Church. This I cannot understand. Christ never taught conflicting lessons, and if any two religious bodies teach conflicting doctrines, one or the other of them is not the Church of Christ, it may be that *neither* is, we know that *both* are not.

"The subjective and the objective, the form and the substance of knowledge, the real and the ideal, are ever readjusting themselves to the advancing generations." It is barely possible that this sentence, upon a close analysis has no meaning, and it may have several. What its author meant I can not positively say. I suppose his meaning is that the truths of the Bible are changed and modified to suit each succeeding generation. If that is his meaning, then he means that the teachings of Christ are chameleon in character, and can change to suit the intellectual bias of the generation. Of course I do not believe this.

He speaks of the "Holy Ghost," why, I can not understand. "Ghost" is a spirit, but it is the spirit of a *dead* man. "Holy Spirit" is the spirit of God. In another place he speaks of "the great initial movements by which the Christian Church advanced, &c." He makes no distinction between the Christian and the Presbyterian Churches. We could not substitute the one adjective for the other, and hence they are not equivalent.

"Biblical Canonicity determines the extent and authority of the various writings that are to be regarded as comprising the sacred canon and discriminates them from all other writings by the criticism of the believing spirit, enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church."

I enquire what is meant by "believing spirit?" Is it a man who believes in the inspiration of the Bible, or one who simply believes in the divinity of Christ? If the former, the canonicity is settled before the question is referred to him; if the latter, I reply that I know of no other way of believing in Christ except through his revealed and inspired testimony. Then if that testimony has produced belief, man has already settled the question. But he says this "believing spirit" must have been previously "enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church." At what time in the history of the Church did the Holy Spirit enlighten and guide the believing spirit? Does it enlighten every believing spirit? If the declaration is true, we can not determine the authority of any Scripture without being so enlightened, for the Holy Spirit does no work that we can do ourselves. How are we to determine whether the Holy Spirit has directed us in our conclusions, seeing that different conclusions have been reached? The quotation we have made says, "enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church." Here comes another difficulty. What Church? The Church of Christ—the Christian Church? We can only determine this question by the Scriptures, and according to this rule, the canonicity is to be settled before we can use them to determine the means by which to determine their canonicity. From these difficulties I conclude that the rule as quoted, is incorrect.

In this review it is not obligatory upon me to give the rules of Biblical Canonics, my task now is simply to point out some of the many difficulties and objections to German, and to be more comprehensive, *modern, liberal* Biblical criticism. Permit me to reiterate the caution, which I deem so much needed, be careful in fol-

lowing the "Higher Literary Critics" of the Bible. I advise, as the safer course, to err on the side of admitting things as proved, than to be on the other extreme of continual investigation; lest we be classed with those who "creep into houses, and take captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts, *ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*"

When I noticed the caption of the 4th article, I expected to see the usual "evangelical and orthodox" description of the character of Alexander Campbell and mis-statement of the teaching of the people called, in derision, "Campbellites;" but in reading the essay I was to some extent agreeably disappointed. In the main, the statements are correct and complimentary, in two or three places only are there mistakes, and these I suppose are not wilful. The essay breathes a spirit so different to that which we have been accustomed, that I feel encouraged to hope for still better things. He makes the mistake in ascribing the religious movement which resulted in the organization of various congregations of Christians, who discarded human names and human creeds, exclusively to Thomas Campbell. The fact is that other men, under different circumstances, without knowledge of each other, were working to the same end. It so happened that after the movement was inaugurated at several points, Alexander Campbell, the son of Thomas Campbell, exhibited more gifts as a writer and speaker than others, and became more familiar to the public.

The author of this essay says of his early preaching that it was thoroughly evangelical. I think he misrepresents Mr. Campbell when he says:

"That when he set forth the delinquencies of the Christian world, and the corrupt designs of the 'mercenary priesthood,' his language was anything but dignified, respectful and courtly. It abounded with vulgar phrases, coarse invectives, clap-trap appeals to current prejudices, low witticisms, bitter raillery, haughty defiance, intermingled occasionally with historic buffoonery, sarcastic gibes, unsparing vituperations, lowlied jests, and wholesale denunciations."

I am tolerably familiar with the writings of Mr. Campbell, and have heard him preach, and I think I understand his character and disposition, and my testimony would be that the above extract is incorrect. Of course I have not read all of his writings, nor heard the one hundredth part of his sermons, and consequently could not say dogmatically that the above was false, but I can say that I believe it to be, and the author owes it to fair dealing to

quote at least one example in support of each charge, and I hereby call upon him to furnish me such proof for publication in the next number of this magazine and the *Presbyterian Review*.

"The disciples of Thomas Paine, of David Hume, of Fanny Wright, the cynic sceptics and the ribald scoffers of the period, scattered all over the new States and Territories, revelled in Mr. Campbell's denunciations of the clergy and the sects, and were more than ever emboldened in their blasphemy and scurrility."

I am of the opinion that he could not prove this, and that he came to the conclusion by induction. I am disposed to admit the truth of the statement, as it so exactly accords with my experience. Any exposure of clerical or ecclesiastical errors is enjoyed by the ungodly; but I do not think Mr. Campbell should be blamed for that. Error should be exposed.

"But it was mostly among the Baptist churches that its (*The Millennial Harbinger*) influence was felt, encouraging disaffection, dissension, and division; drying up the streams of benevolence; strengthening the prejudices of the miserly against salaried ministers; emboldening the heretically inclined to make war on the Calvinistic creeds and covenants of communion and fellowship; and issuing in a wide-spread, undefined, and indefinable latitudinarianism in doctrine and laxity in practice."

This paragraph contains both truth and error. Its influence was mostly among the Baptists; it did encourage disaffection, dissension and division among Baptists; its tendency was not, and it did not dry up the streams of benevolence, in proof of which look at our list of schools and missions. It did teach opposition to the mercenary spirit that had largely taken possession of the clergy, but always taught that the laborer was worthy of his hire, and he that preached the gospel should live by the gospel. What he was condemning was that spirit which looked upon preaching as one of the learned professions and which made men choose it for an occupation as they would Law or Medicine. The next charge is ludicrous in its *naivete*. "Emboldening the heretically inclined to make war on the Calvinistic creeds and covenants of communion and fellowship." Really, he ought to have been burned for so heinous an offence. The idea of encouraging men and women, who were inclined to doubt the *infallibility of Calvin*, to criticise the creed that he promulgated, is too bad! But I will have to plead guilty to the charge. I am inclined to think that such was the tendency of his teaching. His next charge is broader and more serious. "Issuing in a wide-spread, undefined, and indefinable lati-

tudinarianism in doctrine and laxity in practice." This I unqualifiedly pronounce untrue. Our latitudinarianism in doctrine is neither broader or narrower than the divine creed, for we take it, and nothing else, as our rule of faith; and we stand pledged, every single one of us, to renounce anything we may believe whenever it is shown *not* to be taught in the Bible, and to believe everything that *is* taught therein. That is the extent of our latitudinarianism, nothing more and nothing less. Can he say as much for himself and Presbyterianism? What he may mean by "laxity in practice" I do not know. If the meaning is, laxity in the ordinances and church polity, then he has been answered, but if he means individual laxity in morals, then the charge is such that no Christian man would make.

"Baptism, it thus appears, is the *sine qua non* in Mr. Campbell's creed, or system of religious belief. Without it there is not, so far as he could see, any salvation. Faith itself is evinced only by a cordial submission to its public performance. In order to it no previous preparation is demanded—not even conviction of sin, a sense of guilt, contrition of soul, a sense of delight in God a new heart, an assurance of pardon—none of these. No relation of Christian experience, no examination as to evidence of a change of heart, before the church, or a committee, or a session, or a consistory. Only an avowal of belief in the testimony that Jesus is the Messiah, the son of God. Then baptism is to be administered the same day, the same hour, if practicable."

Here again the true and the false are both stated. He says: "Baptism, it thus appears, is the *sine qua non* in Mr. Campbell's creed." His "it thus" follows from an extract which he himself makes from Mr. Campbell, which we are justified in regarding as the one, in all of his writings, most favorable to this position, for had there been a stronger one he would have selected it. The extract is as follows:

"Nothing remains, but that it (baptism) be considered, what it is in truth, the accompanying sign of an accompanying remission; the sign and the seal, or the means and the seal of remission then granted through the water, *connected with the blood of Jesus by the divine appointment, and through our faith in it.*"

That is his premise for his conclusion that baptism is the *sine qua non* in Mr. Campbell's creed; when he states that it must be connected with the blood of Jesus, and through our faith in it. But let us see, from further extracts from Mr. Campbell, what he did teach on this subject.

"Prayer, reading or hearing, and meditation are means of sanctification. But any one of these, without the other, would be incomplete and incompetent

to the end proposed. So of the positive institutions of the Christian system. Baptism, the Lord's day, and the Holy Supper are indispensable provisions of remedial mercy."

After enumerating the seven different causes or means of justification as specified in the New Testament, he says:

"Call these *causes* or *means* of justification, as they may severally indicate an influence or an instrumentality in the consummation of this great act of Divine favour. He that assumes any one or two of them, as the exclusive or one only essential cause of a sinner's justification, acts arbitrarily and hazardously, rather than discreetly or according to the oracles of God."

With these extracts given, no one is justified in ever saying that "baptism is the *sine qua non* in Mr. Campbell's creed." "Faith is evinced only by a cordial submission to its public performance." He forgets that no person is baptized until he has made a public profession of his faith. "Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God?"

"No previous preparation is demanded." Will he please state what other previous preparation is demanded by the Bible. Whatever previous preparation he can show to be demanded by Christ or his Apostles, we will demand; will he agree *not* to demand only what he can show is demanded by them?

"Not even conviction of sin, a sense of guilt, contrition of soul." It seems to me that it would be silly to require something of a man he was already doing. He must be convicted of sin, have a sense of guilt, and a contrition of soul, or he would not publicly confess his faith in Christ and ask to obey him. The Bible requires no further preparation.

"Not even an assurance of pardon." No, Mr. Campbell's creed did not teach that a sinner must have an assurance of pardon before he might be baptized, for the very good reason that the Bible says to a convicted, penitent sinner, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." He could not have an assurance of pardon before he was baptized, if he had to be baptized in order to have his sins washed away.

"No relation of Christian experience." Of course not. No such requirement in the Bible; and if his sins were not pardoned until he was baptized, he was not a Christian and consequently he could not have a Christian experience; and now, thanks to Mr. Campbell, this practice among orthodox people is more honored in the breach than in the observance.

"No examination as to evidence of a change of heart, before the church, or a committee, or a session, or a consistory." This is partly incorrect. When the person is asked if he "believes that Jesus is the Christ," that might be called an examination as to evidence of change of heart. This examination is not done before the Congregation as before the Church, but as before men; "he that confesseth me before men, him will I confess before my Father." It is true that no examination is made before a committee, or a session, or a consistory, for the good and sufficient reason that no such bodies are known in the Bible.

To some serious charges that are usually made against Mr. Campbell and his brethren, he gives correct replies, and we are glad to bear testimony to his justness in these particulars. To the charge that we teach that *no unimmersed person can be saved*, he permits Mr. Campbell to answer for himself. I wish every one who has ever heard the charge could and would read this answer carefully and never forget it.

"WE MAY HOPE THE BEST, BUT CANNOT SPEAK WITH THE CERTAINTY OF KNOWLEDGE."

Mr. Campbell was charged with being an Arian or Unitarian. The author of this essay gives ample extracts from Mr. Campbell's writings to utterly refute the charge, and then says:

"It was not, then, because of even the slightest leaning toward Socinianism, or for any want of faith in the evangelical doctrine of the Trinity, that Mr. Campbell refused to be called a Trinitarian; but simply because he insisted on 'calling Bible doctrines by Bible names.' He believed the doctrine because he found it in the Bible, and rejected the name because it was not a Bible name. In this faith he lived, labored, and died."

He bears ample testimony to "his good service to the cause of the Bible and Protestant Christianity." (By the way, I did not know of but one Christianity.) Speaking of his debate with N. L. Rice, the celebrated Presbyterian preacher, he says Mr. Campbell at last found his equal in learning and skill. I am glad to bear testimony to the learning and skill of Mr. Rice, but wish to say as a matter of history that Mr. Campbell's friends bought more than twice as many copies of the printed debate as were bought by Mr. Rice's friends. This shows which side was best satisfied with the discussion. The same may be said even with more force of the Wilkes-Ditzler debate. Mr. Wilkes selling probably three to Mr. Ditzler's one.

"Throughout his whole career he maintained a reputation for piety." This testimony is freely given; and is followed by this extract from Mr. Campbell's writings, and with which we close our review:

"Let me say, once for all, that I value not, and will never plead for, anything under the name of religion, which does not influence the head, the heart, the tongue, the lips, the hands, the feet—the whole body, soul, and spirit. The blessed gospel is not believed, is not received, is not obeyed, when the heart is not purified, the understanding enlightened, the conscience purged from dead works to serve the living God. The end, object, and consummation of the gospel is *Love from a pure heart, from a good conscience, and from faith unfeigned.*"

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, (published at No. 30 Lafayette Place, N. Y., monthly, for Five Dollars per year,) for July, August and September, has been received. The three numbers contain the usual variety of essays on the living questions of the day, and any one who reads it regularly can not fail to be informed of the progress of American thought.

As promised in our last number, I now revert to an article in the June Number. I refer to the one by L. W. Bacon, entitled, *Andover and Creed-Subscription*. I refer to it not so much because there is anything special in the essay, but as affording the occasion to say some things about *Creeds*.

Our opposition to human creeds has been ridiculed and objected to on the ground that an authorized formulation of doctrine was necessary to fellowship and co-operation. Our answer has always been that if the human creed contained any more than the divine creed, that what was in excess was human and could not be binding upon the consciences of men; that if it contained less, it did not contain enough, for "every Scripture inspired of God, is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness," and therefore should be rejected; and if it contained the same, neither more or less than the Bible, then it was the Bible, and ceased to be human. We claimed that Christ, being a divine law-giver could not fail in giving a perfect code and system, and to say that his language needed human explanation or interpretation so as to be intelligible to ordinary minds, is a reflection upon his divinity. We have shown also that the Church

was organized and put into successful operation without a human creed; and the Christian Church, year by year, as time rolls on, demonstrates the uselessness of human creeds.

But I will notice some of the statements and positions made and assumed in this essay.

"Other communions provide that persons proposed for offices of teaching and government shall be required to give assent to doctrinal standards. The Congregationalists make no such demand of their clergy; but by an abhorrent and demoralizing practice they exact it of children and novices, as the condition of communion in the church."

Here he objects to the practice of requiring novices to subscribe to a human creed and not requiring a resubscription when about to become preachers or professors; or probably it would be more correct to say that he objects to the subscription by novices at all. Let us examine this. All persons, age makes no difference, when they first make an effort to become Christians, are novices; now if they desire to attach themselves to a Congregational Society, they should be told, if they do not already know, why the Congregational Society exists, and when it is explained to them that it exists because its members believe certain things not believed by other people, then it seems to me perfectly reasonable and proper to ask them if such is their belief, and that would be *creed-subscription* by novices. Mr. Bacon thinks this is "an abhorrent and demoralizing practice." His idea being that a novice should be admitted into the fellowship with the creed kept in the back-ground, and that he should be kept in the communion ignorant of the creed, not knowing what the people with whom he was identified taught, until he might wish to become a preacher or teacher, and then to bring the creed out from its hiding-place and demand that he endorse it. In other words, a man might live and die a lay member without ever being required to endorse the creed, but if he proposes to teach then he must subscribe. A man may be a member and die and go to heaven without subscribing to the creed, then I ask with emphasis, what is the use for the creed? I am happy to say that the practice of creed-subscription as applied to lay-members, in all religious organizations, is rapidly going into disuse, so much so that a large number of the members of one of the largest organizations are ignorant of the existence of a human creed in their organization; and in another society, although the existence of a creed is generally known

among them, yet many of them are ignorant of its provisions. He says this practice of examination of novices in the creed, leads to a formalism in questions and answers, and the candidate gives answers, the import of which he does not understand. This is true, and the practice should be abandoned; but not reformed by cutting off some of the top of the tree, but by cutting it up by the roots—by abolishing the creed.

If the practice is transferred from the candidate for admission into the communion to the candidate for preaching or teaching, the same result would follow, and it soon degenerates into a mere formalism, and the subscription is made without any regard to what is contained in the creed. Such being the case the creed had better be abolished.

In this particular case, Mr. Smyth being elected to the Abbott professorship in Andover, was asked to subscribe to the creed as a condition precedent to his installation. This he readily consented to do, regarding it as a mere formality and not as indicating his religious opinions; but the "Visitors" chose to base their opinion of his orthodoxy more upon his published utterances than upon his creed-subscription, and doing so, refused to confirm his appointment. Mr. Bacon thinks that Mr. Smyth should have said that he was not in sympathy with every item of the creed, and have refused to subscribe. I think so too; but I think he should go further, and sever his connection with the religious organization that is built upon a creed that he does not believe. His remaining in the fellowship when he does not believe its articles of corporation is living a lie, and the mere subscribing to the creed on a special occasion is nothing more than he is doing every day. A man who has a correct conception of Christianity and moral integrity will not hold his membership with a religious organization with which he is not in sympathy. Human creeds are the result of individual idiosyncracies and a concatenation of circumstances, and they change as their authors die and the circumstances change. If people who subscribe to these creeds would act honestly, as soon and as often as their views changed they would write new creeds and form new associations; they would not continue in the old associations or subscribe to the old creeds.

There are several lessons to be learned from this Andover controversy. 1. That human creeds, as bonds of union, do not al-

ways prevent schism; 2. That human creeds are not permanent expressions of religious thought; 3. That men will continue to subscribe (give formal assent) to a creed, long after they cease to believe it; and 4. That the New Testament is the only creed that is permanent, and the only one that can be a perfect and perpetual bond of union; not what I believe it *might* say, but what it *does* say. If these lessons are learned, the religious world has made an important advance.

The August No. contains an article by Henry Ward Beecher, subject—*Progress of Thought in the Church*. What Church, he does not say, but as the definite article is used—the Church, I must suppose he intends to refer to the Church that Christ built, the Church of Christ—the Christian Church. If this is correct, then just what he meant by “progress of thought” in the Church is not so clear. If the Church is used in a sense that admits of its containing something, then it must be an organization, and being an organization, it must, from its nature, be composed of persons. The Church, as an organization composed of persons, must think by and through these persons, and then if there is “progress of thought,” it must be in the persons. These persons think continually, they could think in a circle, if they progress in their thinking, they get out of this circle. How do these people think in this capacity of being a Church? It can not be individual and independent thinking, for that would be ordinary thinking, while this is Church thinking, then Church thought must be aggregate and harmonious thinking. The head does the thinking, the other members execute. Christ is the head of *the* Church; then the thought of the Church is Christ thinking; then if there is any progress of thought in the Church there must be an advance in Christ’s thinking. He did not mean this—I suppose he meant that persons composing the Church were arriving at more correct conclusions as to what Christ taught. I will so understand him.

The trouble with him, and others in like condition, is that they take human religious organizations to be *the Church* and write accordingly. This is very incorrect and unfortunate. There are so many religious organizations, all thinking differently, that while one might progress, others would not, and if all did progress, it still would not be the Church of Christ that was progressing. The occasion of his writing the essay was the Andover controversy, to

which we have just referred, and he is speaking particularly about progress among Calvinists. There may be progress of thought in the Church of Calvin, but there can be no progress of thought in the Church of Christ, for Calvin was a man—fallible; Christ was divine—infallible. The one was founded by a man, the other by God.

"Eminent and good men have been infidel to church creeds, seldom to religion." Why did he not say instead of "church creeds" human creeds? and then say; Away with human creeds!

"Men are coming to believe the function of churches to be eminent and divine, but not their structure and origin." Their functions are of God and hence command the respect of men; their structure and origin are of men and hence have no special claim upon our credulity. It would be so much better if he would not speak of "churches," there is only one true church, *The Church of Christ*. If we would discard this false nomenclature, we would be more consistent.

"Churches have grown from the necessities of human nature seeking moral elevation, as schools grow up from the necessities of intellectual development; eleemosynary institutions grow from the requirements of humanity; as civil governments grow out of the necessities of society. God created human nature, and, in a sense, all that is necessary to it. He created iron, but not machinery; forests, but not furniture; textile substances, but not garments; colors, but not pictures; a religious nature in man, but not schools for religion."

What he means I can not gather even from his illustrations. Churches—religious organizations—have grown from the necessities of human nature seeking moral elevation, as schools grow up from the necessities of intellectual development. Why do schools grow up? From the necessities of intellectual development. What are the necessities of intellectual development? As the intellect is developed, there is more and more demand for knowledge, and schools are established to meet this demand. As man becomes more morally elevated he demands institutions that will assist him in his further elevation. He first learned morality from God, and all the moral elevation that he has ever attained came from God's institutions, and the greatest elevation has come from *The Church of Christ*. God established *The Church* to elevate man, schools were established by men to educate their fellow-men, and they have expanded and improved as man has gained experience; but the

church, in its laws, ordinances and conception, sprang complete from the mind of God. He was not experimenting; he made no experiments to be arrested by experience; his system was complete, it needed no expansion, it was for the whole world. "He created a religious nature in man, but not schools for religion." Christ thought differently.

"Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you;" "He that teacheth, to his teaching;" "Admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ;" "In all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms, hymns and spiritual songs;" "and the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

Without further citations the reader will see that God did create schools for religion. If created by God they are perfect; the text book to be taught is from him and also perfect; and the manner of teaching is also from him and therefore perfect; therefore all being perfect there can be no progress in the thought of the Church.

I now make a quotation that is *unique*.

"A better spirit prevails among sects. The lines of division are but lines, and not walls. There is no sign of outward mechanical unity, but there is an increasing sympathy between churches of differing creeds and ordinances. Clergymen can now pass from one denomination to another without insincerity. One may in succession join or preach in the Methodist, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Congregationalist churches, with no more imputation of having changed faith, or been insincere, than would a citizen be charged with civic indifference or insincerity, who in succession should reside in Connecticut, New York, Ohio and Oregon."

1. The last thought first. The United States represents the Church of Christ. The States represent the various sects; collectively the church. The States were in existence before the United States—the former created the latter. The Church of Christ first, then divisions—sects. The States gave up and retained some of their elements of power. The sects took some of the principles from the Church, but added many others without authority.

2. One may in succession join or preach for every sect and not change faith. The faith of all must then be the same, only in sect polity then do they differ. If it is faith that saves, and no virtue in the several polities, why keep up the divisions, when Christ

so emphatically opposed them? All admit that the sects are the most fruitful cause of skepticism and infidelity, and the greatest hindrance to the spread of the Gospel. In religion as in politics, union gives strength, division weakness. Then let all good men turn their backs upon "sects" and unite their energies to the up-building of the Church of Christ. It has but one Head, but one text-book, let us unite under him with that as our only rule of faith and practice. Mr. Beecher will say that we can not all understand its lessons alike. Then Christ as a law-giver was a failure. But we can understand it alike. The trouble is not in *not knowing* what he commands, as in speculating as to what would be best to do beyond what he prescribed, or in theorizing as to why he did such things, or if some other things would not do as well. We can unite if we will do everything commanded, leave undone everything not commanded, and cease to speculate about unrevealed things. *There is not a single thing now dividing the religious world that is not outside of the New Testament.* Let us enumerate. The name. Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, &c., are not in the Bible. Drop them. Take a Scripture name, and that far there is union. Church officers. More than one kind of Elders—lay, clerical and presiding; Bishops—diocesan, arch-bishops, metropolitan, &c., are not in the Bible. Drop them. Do as Paul commanded Timothy to do, and we will all do alike and we will have union in church government. Doctrine. Preach the Gospel, nothing else, and we will preach the same thing. Do not preach infant baptism—for that is not in the Bible. (I say this because no one now living, who is a representative man, says it is.) Do not preach that sprinkling or pouring is baptism, in the New Testament sense, for they are not. (I say this also, for no representative man now living will say so.) Drop them. No man will deny that Christ said *immerse*. Teach immersion, and that only, and that far we have union. Teach that faith comes by hearing the Gospel, and not by a direct revelation to each individual, for the inspired writers teach the first, they do not teach the latter. Do not teach it. Practice weekly commemoration of his death, because it was the custom in the time of the apostles, and do not spread the table monthly, quarterly or yearly. Do as the apostles did, and we will be united on that. Do not preach about the *Trinity*, and make it a test of fellowship, for the word is not

found in the Bible. Drop it. Do not preach predestination, or make it a test of fellowship, for neither Christ or his apostles ever preached or taught it as an item of faith or fellowship. Drop it. If your discipline requires class-meetings, stewards, love-feasts, do not have them because they are not authorized or commanded in the Bible, and are items of scism and division. Drop them. I forbear further enumeration. I have given enough for illustration.

"One may join all the sects in succession without changing his faith." I would like to see a Baptist join the Methodists and retain the same faith, or an Episcopalian join the Cumberland Presbyterians. I merely mention these to show the absurdity of the statement.

"It is no wish of ours that the Roman Catholic Church should perish. It is the grandest organization of time. Its aim is sublime and its achievements wonderful. * * * I am her son, her brother, her lover."

I make this quotation simply for the purpose of showing how absurd Mr. Beecher can be.

I make the following extract because I believe it is true, and as showing the drift of the age:

"Little by little the pulpit shrinks from mediæval theology. Ministers first gloss it by new interpretations, then they prudently hold it in suspense, then doubt it, then cast it away."

The Christian Church, that has Christ for its head and the New Testament for its creed, does not have to gloss its theology, hold it in suspense, doubt it or cast it away.

"There is a strong and growing tendency to enlarge the sphere of Divine Revelation by adding to the Bible the revelation of Nature, and of man's reason and moral consciousness, which are a chief part of Nature. * * * * * In an important sense the Sacred Scriptures are of God. They contain precious truth. By their moral unity, and by their accord with human reason and intelligent moral consciousness, they justly hold authority over men's conduct and character. They have authority only concurrently with educated human reason and national moral sense."

What is the sphere of Divine Revelation? Man's salvation. How can this be enlarged? I do not know. If it is enlarged by adding any thing to it, the addition will be without Divine authority. He proposes to add to it the revelation of Nature and man's reason and consciousness. What is meant by the "revelation of Nature?" "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork." This is all the revelation of Na-

ture that I know of, and it is no addition to Divine Revelation. He proposes also to add "man's reason and moral consciousness." I know what this means. It means that if Divine Revelation says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," if man's reason and moral consciousness say, you need not be baptized, or if you insist on being baptized, although Divine Revelation and the practice of the Apostles and the early Christian, say immerse, yet sprinkling or pouring will do just as well, it is the spirit of the act, not the form, that is important. This is the enlargement of Divine Revelation that man's reason, emancipated from the bondage of the Bible, would make. "The Bible has authority only concurrently with educated human reason and rational moral sense." This is blasphemy. God's word only to have authority by permission of educated human reason! The Jews demanded the death of Christ because he claimed that he was equal to God. Now what shall we say of Mr. Beecher when he makes man superior to God?

One more quotation and we dismiss the essay:

"The development of physical science constitutes the grand feature of the last half-century. The doctrine of the *Conservation of Forces*, and the discovery of the method of creation, viz., *Evolution*, while revolutionizing physical science, will powerfully reform moral and social theories. At length the flood of ignorance has abated, and the dove of truth has solid ground on which to put its foot. * * * * *

It matters little that upon some points the great doctrine of evolution is yet in discussion. The debate is not about the reality of evolution, but, of the influences which produce or direct it. * * * That the animal kingdom developed from original simple forms, and attained its present condition through ages of gradual unfolding from lower to higher; that the human race has been subject to the same great law and method of creation—may be said to be undisputed among scientific men, whether Christian or not Christian. This is not all. The presumption gains ground that the chain of succession is unbroken, and that, as civilized man unfolded from the barbaric and savage man, so the human race itself is developed from the animal kingdom."

Evolution is the solid ground upon which truth can rest! Progressive development is not disputed by scientists, whether Christian or infidel! Why Mr. Beecher wrote these two statements, I can not imagine. He surely knows that the theories of *Evolution* and *Progressive Development* have been successfully disproved numberless times, and that among skeptical and semi-infidel scientists the theories find fewer friends than they did two years

ago. They were novel theories, and their originality gave them notoriety and a quasi-popularity. This broad-gauge, progressive spirituality catches at every thing that tends to throw discredit upon the Bible, but the grand old book stands unshaken in its Divine character, the only guide man has from earth to heaven.

The same magazine for September has the following articles: 1. Political Assessments, by Dorman B. Eaton; 2. Oaths in Legal Proceedings, by Judge Edward A. Thomas; 3. Tornadoes and their Causes, by T. B. Maury; 4. Architecture in America, by Clarence Cook; 5. Constitutional Protection of Property Rights; 6. Earth-Burial and Cremation, by Augustus G. Cobb; 7. The Geneva Award and Ship-Owners, by J. F. Manning.

The October Number contains: 1. The Coming Revolution in England, by H. M. Hyndman; 2. The Morally Objectionable in Literature, by O. B. Frothingham; 3. Recent Discoveries at Troy, by Dr. Henry Schliemann; 4. Political Bosses, by Senator John I. Mitchell; 5. Safety in Railway Travel, by Prof. George L. Vose; 6. The Protection of Forests, by Prof. Charles S. Sargent.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, (published and edited by J. R. Brames, D. D., 180 Elm St., Cincinnati, Ohio,) for July, is received. The article—*Baptist Principles, Practices, and Polity: Their soundness vindicated by their natural results and logical consequences.* By T. S. Dunnaway, D. D., suggests a thought or two.

"In this article the aim will be to vindicate the soundness of Baptist principles, practices, and polity, not by an appeal to Scripture, but by an argument drawn from their natural results and legitimate and logical consequences.

Agreeing with other denominations in all the principles of evangelical religion, the Baptists have peculiar views of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. They hold that only believers are proper subjects of baptism; that only immersion is baptism; that baptism is a prerequisite to church membership, and the Lord's Supper, which is a symbolical feast never to be observed except by a church in its corporate capacity, and for no purpose except to promote the spiritual good of the communicant and the glory of the Redeemer.

They hold that a visible Church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers, voluntarily associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel, observing the ordinances as once delivered to the saints, rendering obedience to the laws of Christ, and spreading the Gospel throughout the world. A true Church of Christ is an association of regenerated and baptized

believers, united on spiritual principles for spiritual ends, and in the use of spiritual means. All the Churches organized after the apostolic models must be voluntary and independent organizations, managing their own internal affairs, recognizing no human authority outside of themselves, civil or ecclesiastical. The Baptists have always believed that the sanctity of the body of Christ is personal and not corporate; that the work of the Holy Spirit in the individual heart is indispensable, and must be experienced before any of the ordinances can be attended to or any of the privileges of God's house enjoyed; and that the churches are not, as it were, nurseries designed to raise up such as are born in them, or enter them for the spiritual and invisible kingdom; but that they must be members of the mystical body of Christ before they are eligible to a place in the visible, local Church.

The doctrine of the spirituality of the Church, and that all the members are supposed to be 'lively stones built up into a spiritual house, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ,' is utterly inconsistent with an ecclesiastical hierarchy, infant baptism, a mixed membership, and a sacerdotal ministry."

I have given so long an extract in order that the *animus* of the essay may be fully before my readers, and I now proceed to its review. He makes the Baptists agree with other denominations in all the principles of evangelical religion, but claims that they hold peculiar views about baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Church organization and polity. He can not therefore credit any good resulting from any doctrine to the Baptists exclusively, except such good as may entirely result from their peculiar views about baptism, the Lord's Supper and Church organization and polity. Although the Baptists have in some respects come nearer to the New Testament standard than other religious people (excepting the Christian Church, which claims to differ in nothing from the New Testament model), yet her writers and speakers indulge in a religious dialect that is fearfully at variance with the language of Christ and the inspired writers. In the extract I have made, four or five examples can be found. "*Baptist principles, &c.*" No such phrase or idea in the Bible. There we learn of the *doctrine of Christ*, but nothing about "Baptist principles." There is no such church, people or sect, as "Baptists," known in the Bible, not even by implication. If they have principles, practices and a polity which make them the "Baptist Church," of course they are not the principles, practices and polity of the Church of Christ, or for euphony, Christian Church, for if they were, then the Baptist Church would be the Christian Church and not the Baptist

Church; but those who constitute this organization say it is the "Baptist" church, and we must give them credit for knowing what they are.

"Evangelical religion." There is no such phrase in the Bible, and there is no sense in it. Evangelical has been defined, without any authority from the word of God, to mean, "relating to the Gospels." Evangelist means a messenger; in the New Testament, a preacher of the Gospel; "evangelical" would therefore mean, "relating to the work of a preacher of the Gospel," and not to the Gospel itself. "Evangelical religion" is therefore an abuse of language and not warranted by the Bible. "Visible Church of Christ" and "A true Church of Christ." No such phrases in the Bible. There is only one Church, although in the New Testament it is spoken of generally and locally. Every Christian is a component part of the Church of Christ, and he is as much a member of the Church when there is not another Christian in a thousand miles of him as when he is associated with a thousand other Christians. In this general sense there is *The Church*. When two or more Christians worship together and set apart certain men to have the spiritual oversight of them, then the word is used in a local sense, and we have *the Churches*, or congregations, or local collections of Christians. But there is no visible, or invisible, or true Church, for "true" implies that there may be an "untrue" Church of Christ. "Mystical body of Christ." This cannot be found in the Bible. "Mystical—remote from human comprehension; obscure." Then the "body of Christ," when used to designate the Church in its general significance, is remote from human comprehension and obscure. I would be sorry to have that idea of the Church that Christ established.

Let us see how much credit must be given to the Baptists for religious freedom and soul liberty (whatever that may be); for the development of the highest type of civil liberty and the best forms of human government; for the suppression of religious persecution; and for the development of individual piety and the promotion of the general cause of religion. These four things he claims as the especial results of Baptist peculiarities. Bearing in mind that these peculiarities are, immersion, the Lord's Supper only for Baptists, an adult immersed membership, and congregational independency, we can then bring together and keep together in our minds cause

and effect. Immersion, close communion, a membership of immersed believers, and congregational independency, producing religious freedom, civil liberty and the best form of human government, abolishment of religious persecution, and increase of piety.

I fail to see how *immersion*, instead of sprinkling or pouring, could produce religious freedom, civil liberty, abolish religious persecution and increase personal piety; or how these things (if they had been brought about exclusively by immersionists, which I deny) could prove that immersion was right. I also fail to see how teaching and practicing that Baptists should partake of the Lord's Supper only with Baptists and then only in an organized congregation, could produce any of these results, or how these results, if brought about exclusively by Baptists, could prove that such teaching was right. I also further fail to see how a membership restricted to immersed believers or congregational independency could produce these results; or how these results, if brought about exclusively by a set of people believing these things, could prove these things correct. Of course it is absurd to say that teaching that immersion is apostolic, to the exclusion of sprinkling and pouring, that close communion is right, and adult immersed membership is the only membership, produced those results. I suppose that the doctrine and practice of congregational independency might with more reason be said in a remote degree to favor those things. Congregational independency should favor religious freedom and oppose religious persecution; but as connected with the Baptists it is so fettered that its influence can not be felt. They have a general "confession of faith" to which each person is presumed to subscribe before taking membership, and hence in matters of faith there is no congregational independency. There can be no true congregational independency with a human creed as a bond of union. The Bible and the Bible alone must be the only bond of union in a true system of congregational independency. In this the Baptists come short. But congregational independency is itself a result, not a cause. It is a result of being governed by the New Testament, and it teaches other principles which go to make up the doctrine of Christ, which produce all these enumerated blessings, religious freedom, civil liberty, religious toleration and personal piety. Search the Scriptures; prove all things, hold fast to the true; let every man examine himself; call no man master,

and many others of like import, led to religious freedom. Civil liberty naturally and irresistably followed religious freedom. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is the foundation of religious toleration; and personal piety follows from a love of Christ, and is not confined to any religious organization.

While I believe that immersion only is Christian baptism, that congregational independency is clearly taught in the New Testament, and that only immersed believers constitute the church, yet I am not so self-conceited as to believe that these *credenda* produce all these blessings, nor that the existence of these blessings prove that these items of faith are correct. I go to the word of God for my creed and its defence, and not to human history. I deny that the Baptists have been conspicuous in the advocacy or practice of religious toleration, or that they have excelled the pedobaptists in advocacy or defence of personal and political liberty.

I wish to enter my denial of the doctrine that the Lord's Supper should never be observed except by a congregation in its corporate capacity. The doctrine is entirely repugnant to inspired teaching, if I am not mistaken. When the Supper was instituted, there was no organized congregation and nothing said about such an organization; only the twelve were present. Speaking to them Christ said, "as often as you do this, do it in remembrance of me." This was said to them as individual Christians, and through them comes down to us as individuals. According to the Baptist doctrine when there are a number of immersed believers in any locality but not organized into a corporate body, probably because there are no persons having the qualifications of elders, they can not celebrate the Lord's Supper, and thus refresh themselves spiritually by showing their remembrance of him. The Bible does not teach it, and I do not believe it.

"That the work of the Holy Spirit in the individual heart is indispensable, and must be experienced before any of the ordinances can be attended to or any of the privileges of God's house enjoyed, * * and they must be members of the mystical body of Christ before they are eligible to a place in the visible, local church."

"The work of the Holy Spirit in the individual heart is indispensable and must be experienced" before a man can be baptized or partake of the Lord's Supper. What is this work of the Holy Spirit which is indispensable and must be experienced? If it is meant that the individual must be convinced that he is a sinner

and needs the pardoning mercy of God before he is baptized or partake of the Lord's Supper, then he is right; but if he means, (which I suppose he does), that the Spirit of God must bear direct testimony to the man that he is pardoned before he is permitted to be baptized, I do not believe it; I can not with the Bible open before me. There is not one word in the Bible that intimates that the Holy Spirit, separate from the word, of God, pardons or does any work in the human heart in connection with pardon. God never does or requires works of supererogation. If a man's sins are forgiven at a certain time, he is not required to do something afterwards to accomplish the same thing. If the Holy Spirit had pardoned Paul's sins before he was baptized, the Holy Spirit (which it is claimed had already done the work), would not have told him, through its agent, Ananias, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." The trouble is that the Baptists on account of their erroneous theory of "pardon" have no use for baptism in that connection, but as it is enjoined in the Bible, they endeavor to find some other use for it, and make it an initiatory rite into the local church. According to their theory, by the work of the Holy Spirit a man may be a member of the church in its general sense, a child of God, a Christian, without baptism, but in order that he may be a Baptist he must be baptized; thus requiring more to make a man a Baptist than a Christian. Their theory confines the Lord's Supper to Baptists, for no one, although he may have this work of the Holy Spirit in his heart and be a child of God, can partake of this Supper until he becomes a Baptist. This does not convince me that Baptist doctrine is *par excellence*, the doctrine that teaches and promotes religious liberty. The Baptists have a very high regard and respect for the word of God, why will they not give up these old human theories, borrowed from Rome, and teach and do as the Bible teaches? I pray God that the time may speedily come.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, (edited by Henry Mason Baum, and published by the *American Church Review Press*, N. Y.) for April, has the following table of contents:

1. The Problem of Evil, by T. M. Clarke, D. D., LL. D.;

2. Revision of the Common Prayer, by Hon. John W. Andrews;
3. Reason and Authority in Matters of Religion, by Prof. W. D. Wilson;
4. The Financial Question in the Church, by James Craik, D. D., LL. D.;
5. The Revised Version, by G. T. Bedell, D. D.;
6. A Last Word on the Revision, by W. C. Doane, D. D., LL. D.;
7. Church Music and its Future in America, by Prof. E. N. Potter;
8. "O Holy Church," A Poem, by Prof. Henry Coppee, LL. D.;
9. Of Divorce, by A. St. John Chambre, LL. D.;
10. The Beginning of the Reformation in Sweden, by C. M. Butler, D. D.;
11. The Comprehensiveness of the Anglican Communion, by George Woolsey Hodge, M. A.;
12. Christianity Proved by the Resurrection of Christ, (Second Article), by Prof. Henry A. Yardley;
13. The Centennial Jubilee of German Literature, by J. I. Mombert, D. D.

The No. for July contains:

1. The Scottish Communion Office, by the Bishop of Connecticut;
2. Another Aspect of the Financial Question in the Church, by Samuel Wagner;
3. Hallucinations, Delusions, and Inspiration, by John J. Elmendorf, D. D.;
4. Nestorian Missions in China, by Daniel M. Bates, A. M.;
5. A Church College, by Prof. John T. Huntington;
6. The Establishment and the Struggles of the Reformation in Sweden, by C. M. Butler, D. D.;
7. Three Religions, by Robert F. Jackson, Jr.;
8. Canon Law, by Henry R. Percival;
9. The Prison of the Spirits, and the Spirit Their Preacher, by Samuel Fuller, D. D.;
10. Federate Council of the Province of Illinois, by J. H. Hopkins, D. D.;
11. The Reformation and Mediævalism, by Benjamin Franklin, D. D.;
12. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, by Julius H. Ward, M. A.;
13. Apostolic Succession in the Church of Sweden, by J. P. Tustin, D. D.;
14. Temporal Salvation, by C. C. Adams, S. T. D.;
15. St. Paul's Vision of Christ, and its Physical Effects, by William Burnet, A. M.;
16. Literary Notices.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW, (No. 141 Franklin St., Boston, \$3.00 per year), for July and August, have been received, and their Tables of Contents are as follows:

JULY Contents: 1. Scholastic Theology, by J. H. Allen; 2. Personal Influence a Preventive, by Kate Garnett Wells; 3. Sense of Proportion in Religious Inquiry, by Thomas R. Slicer; 4. Sentiment, by Henry W. Bellows, D. D.

AUGUST contents: 1. The Religious Outlook, by F. B. Hornbrooke; 2. The Book of Doom, by David H. Montgomery; 3. Scholastic Theology, by J. A. Allen; 4. Buddhist Birth Stories, by James T. Bixby; 5. Meditations on my Birthday, by Robert Collyer.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Edited by the Theological Faculty of Cumberland University, at Lebanon, Tenn. \$2.00 per year.

The July No. contains the following articles: 1. Law, by Hon. R. C. Ewing; 2. Agnosticism, by W. H. Black; 3. Cumberland Presbyterianism in Texas, by J. A. J. Reach, D. D.; 4. What will the Negro do with Himself? by Jno Miller McKee; 5. Correlation of Forces, by Hon. S. A. Rodgers; 6. The Philosophy of Christian Happiness, by B. F. Whittemore; 7. Jewish Baptism, by H. M. Irwin; 8. Theological Views of Ewing and Donnell, by Richard Beard, D. D.; 9. Editorial, by Prof. J. D. Kirkpatrick; 10. Literary Notices; 11. Among our Exchanges.

MANFORD'S MAGAZINE, (Chicago, \$1.50 per year, monthly) for July, August and September, is received. A sprightly and aggressive magazine, leading rather than following Universalist thought.

THE UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, (16 Bromfield St., Boston, \$3.00 per year, pp 128.) This is the recognized standard of Universalism in the United States. It is ably edited and has a good list of contributors.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, (Edited by Edwards A. Park, and published by W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass. Price \$4.00 per year, pp 192.) The July No. contains:

1. Mediæval German Schools, by James Davie Butler, LL. D. 2. Greece as a European Kingdom, by A. N. Arnold, D. D.; 3. The Legend of the Buddha, and the Life of the Christ, by S. H. Kellogg, D. D.; 4. The History of Research concerning the Structure of the O. T. Historical Books, by Prof. Archibald Duff, M. A., LL. D.; 5. The Integrity of the Book of Isaiah, by Wm. Henry Cobb; 6. Theological Education; 7. The "Sacred Books of the East, by Charles W. Park; 8. Notices of Recent Publications.

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Thomas G. Apple, D. D., and published at 907 Arch St., Philadelphia. Price \$3.00. pp. 160.

July No. contains: 1. Allegorical Poetry of England; by

Wm. M. Nevins, LL. D.: 2. Triumphs, Hopes, and Aims of Russia, by J. O. Johnson; 3. Wilford Hall's New Philosophy, by John I. Swander, A. M.; 4. Pentateuch Criticism: Its History and Present State, by F. A. Gast, D. D.; 5. The Church a Perpetual Necessity, by I. E. G.; 6. Cicero as a Moral Philosopher, by A. R. Kremer, A. M.; 7. The Way of Life. A Baccalaureate Sermon by the President of Franklin and Marshall College; 8. Church Debts, by Geo. H. Johnson; 9. Recent Publications:

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by D. D. Wheldon, LL. D. Published by Phillips & Hunt, 805 Broadway, N. Y. Price \$2.50 per year. pp 200.

July No. contains: An excellent steel engraving of GEORGE I. SENEY; New Japan, by R. S. Maclay, D. D.; American Lutherans and their Divisions, by H. K. Carroll; A Glance at the Literature of Sanskrit, by L. A. Sherman, Ph. D.; Jesus a Total Abstainer, by Leon G. Field; The Wandering Jew and his Congeners, by Robert R. Doherty; The Theory and Practice of Methodist Episcopacy, by J. T. Peck, D. D.; The Great Convent of San Francisco in Mexico City, by Thomas Carter, D. D.; Synopsis of the Quarterlies; Foreign Religious Intelligence; Foreign Literary Intelligence; Quarterly Book Table.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH. Edited by J. W. Hinton, No. 180 Poplar St., Macon, Georgia. Published by the *Southern Methodist Publishing House*, Nashville, Tenn. Price \$3.00 per year. pp 192.

The July No. contains: Apologetics, (name of author not given); The Religion of the Druids, by J. N. Fradenburgh, Ph. D.; Christian Culture, by G. W. Horn; The Genuineness of the Book of Daniel, by Wilbur F. Tillett, A. M.; The Rev. Thomas Osmond Summers, D. D., LL. D., by D. C. Kelley, D. D.; New English, by Pres. A. B. Stark; Lessons from the Life of St. Peter, by Bishop A. W. Wilson; Literary Notices; Notes and Queries; Editorial Salutory.

Dr. Summers, the former editor, having died during the session of the last General Conference at Nashville, Dr. J. W. Hinton, of Macon, Ga., was chosen to succeed him. In the death of Dr. Summers, the Southern Methodist Church sustained a great loss. He was a man of culture, piety and unlimited zeal and industry. I hope that culture and Christian zeal may distinguish his successor. Men so endowed are needed in such positions at this time.

BOOK NOTICES.

A TRIP AROUND THE WORLD. A SERIES OF LETTERS BY TIMOTHY COOP AND HENRY EXLEY. With Twelve Albertype Plates. pp. 221. Published by H. C. Hall & Co., 180 Elm St., Cincinnati, Ohio, 1882. (From the Publishers.)

This neat little volume contains a series of letters, originally published in the *Standard*, written by two of our brethren, one an Englishman and the other an Americanized Englishman, describing particularly their visit to the Churches in Australia. It is simple in style, interesting in matter and devotional in spirit. It is well worth reading and preserving for reference.

A GRAMMAR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By Alexander Buttmann. Authorized Translation. Published by Warren F. Draper, Andover, Mass. Price \$2.75.

No student of the New Testament in the Greek can afford to be without this book or the one by Winer.

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE AUTHENTICITY, CANON, AND TEXT OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. By E. C. Mitchell. Illustrated by Diagrams, Tables, and a Map. Published by Warren F. Draper, Andover, Mass. pp 157. Price \$1.75.

ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION: *Its Origin and Early Growth; Its Place in the Churches; and its Value.* By B. A. Hinsdale, A. M., President of Hiram College; and author of several books. pp 200. Price 50 cents. Published by *Standard Publishing Co.*, 180 Elm St., Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN CHURCH: A MONOGRAPH. By B. A. Hinsdale, A. M., and President of Hiram College. pp 111. Price

30 cents. Published by *Standard Publishing Co.*, 180 Elm St., Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE BOOK OF ENOCH: TRANSLATED FROM THE ETHIOPIC, with Introduction and Notes, by Rev. George H. Schodde, Ph. D. Professor in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, 1882, pp 277, price \$1.75—Published by Warren F. Draper, Andover, Mass.

In the Epistle of Jude we find a quotation taken from "Enoch, the seventh from Adam." It was well known from many citations and extracts in the Church Fathers that an apocryphal Book of Enoch existed in the early days of Christianity, and was regarded by many with great admiration, and enjoyed considerable authority. By those who are competent to give an opinion, this translation is regarded as a valuable contribution to this class of literature.

STUDIES IN SCIENCE AND RELIGION, by G. Frederick Wright, Author of the *Logic of Christian Evidences*, 1882, pp 390, price \$1.50. Published by Warren F. Draper, Andover, Mass. I give the contents, simply remarking that the treatment of the subjects is neither narrow, weak or dull. 1. Ground of Confidence in Inductive Reasoning; 2. Statement of the Argument for Darwinism; 3. Objections to Darwinism Stated and Considered; 4. Darwinism and Design; 5. Analogies between Darwinism and Calvinism; 6. An Essay on Prehistoric man; 7. The Bible and Science.

A TREATISE ON CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT, by T. W. Brents. Price 10 cents. Published by C. C. Cline & Co., Louisville, Ky. This is a tract of 35 pages, reprinted from the *Old Path Guide*.

Dr. Brents is a clear, vigorous and conscientious writer, and I would advise a general reading of this pamphlet. It is not as exhaustive as is desirable, nor is it, in my opinion, correct in all its conclusions. If it awakens renewed study, with the present helps now in our possession, it will have done a good work.

MODERN DANCING AMONG CHURCH MEMBERS. By J. F. Floyd. A tract of 36 pages. John Burns, Publisher, 717 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo. Price 10 cents.

NEW CHRISTIAN HYMN AND TUNE BOOK. Published by Fillmore Bros., Cincinnati, Ohio. pp 312. Price, according to binding, 60 cents to \$5.00. The mechanical execution of the book is good. As far as I can judge the selection of music and songs is good. It is issued in editions with or without music. The cheap editions are supplied to churches at from \$2.60 to \$3.60 per dozen.

MY PORTFOLIO. A Collection of Essays, by Austin Phelps, D. D., Late Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, Author of *Men and Books*, and *The Theory of Preaching*. pp 280. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1882.

This book contains *thirty-one* interesting Essays on Religious subjects. The reputation of the author as a writer and teacher, and the subjects treated, will induce persons, who delight in pure and thoughtful reading, to procure this book.

We suppose the price of the book will be \$1.50, though the Publishers failed to inform us.

THE BIBLE STUDENT'S ECLECTIC MONTHLY, is the title of a periodical that Bro. Dr. John T. Walsh, of Kinston, N. C., proposes to publish. In his Prospectus, he says:

"I purpose at an early day to publish a Monthly with the above title. It will be devoted chiefly to a faithful exposition of the Scriptures, including Essays, Reviews and Criticisms. It will give all the principal rules of Biblical interpretation, with illustrations or examples under each rule. It will not confine its teaching to first principles, nor be run in old worn out theological ruts. Its prime object will be to expound the word of God by making that book its own interpreter.

The editor brings to his work the experience and research of half a century, and with the help of the Lord, upon whom he relies for all things, he will make it a fitting close of a protracted life. It will not be a local or sectional periodical, and hence it will not

antagonize any other paper, no matter where nor by whom published. I aim to make it a faithful, courteous Review of all questions relating to the Scriptures.

It will contain 32 pages, with a neat cover, and be mailed to subscribers for \$1 per volume of 12 numbers. No money required until the first number is announced, when all subscriptions will be expected to be promptly paid. Any preacher, teacher, brother or sister, who will procure five subscribers and remit \$5, shall have the sixth copy free. Address Dr. John T. Walsh, Kinston, N. C."

NOTE:—The MSS. for the article by G. W. Longan in the July No., and the one by J. W. McGarvey in this No., were received about the same time, having been written without any mutual understanding. Being in the same line of thought, but treating the same general subject from different standpoints, this statement is necessary.

THE BACCALAUREATE SERMON, the first article in this No., was delivered by M. RHODES, D. D., *Pastor of St. Mark's Eng. Evan. Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo.* It was an oversight that his name was not given in the foot note on the first page.

YOUR ATTENTION is particularly called to the *Announcement on fourth page of the Cover.* Please read it very carefully, and act accordingly.

EDITOR.

